

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 415

PS 015 873

AUTHOR Alvy, Kerby T.; Rosen, Larry D.
TITLE Training Parenting Instructors: A National Model for Training Mental Health, Social Service and Educational Personnel to Deliver Group Parent Training Services in Their Agencies.

INSTITUTION National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Rockville, MD.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.

PUB DATE Jan 84
GRANT NIMH-MH-14384
NOTE 249p.

AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, 11331 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 103, Studio City, CA 91604 (\$20.00, plus \$1.50 postage and handling, California residents add sales tax).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Child Rearing; Children; Interpersonal Relationship; Mental Health; Models; *National Programs; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Staff Development; Staff Role; *Training Methods; Workshops

IDENTIFIERS National Institute of Mental Health; *Personnel for Parent Development Program; Therapeutic Communication

ABSTRACT

This report provides a comprehensive description and discussion of 5 years of activities supported by the National Institute of Mental Health for the Personnel for Parent Development Program designed to train mental health, social service and educational professionals to deliver specific types of group parent training services. The report details group training services that can teach parents to use specialized child management and therapeutic communications and can help stimulate positive child-rearing attitudes. It begins by indicating the national significance of the program and the local issues that had to be dealt with as it was created and implemented. Program objectives and aspects of the program are described, including actual training events. In addition, the report presents an evaluation of the program and discusses the results in terms of efficacy and future direction. The report concludes with a summation of the program and its results. An extensive appendix provides the documents and materials that are necessary for program replication and evaluation. (HOD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

TRAINING PARENTING INSTRUCTORS:

A National Model for Training Mental Health, Social
Service and Educational Personnel to Deliver Group
Parent Training Services in their Agencies

by

Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D. and Larry D. Rosen, Ph.D.

TABLE 1

COMPARISONS OF PARENT TRAINING PROGRAMS:

PARENTING METHODS TAUGHT

<u>METHODS</u>	<u>PET</u>	<u>STEP</u>	<u>CP</u>
Verbal Appreciation			
Behavior-Specific Praise	NO	NO	YES
Encouragement	NO	YES	NO
Positive I-Messages	YES	NO	NO
Confrontation			
Confrontive I-Messages	YES	YES	NO
Disapproval	NO	NO	YES
Therapeutic Listening	YES	YES	NO*
Self-Disclosure	YES	YES	NO*
Feeling Identification	YES	YES	NO
Problem Ownership	YES	YES	NO
Exploring Alternatives	NO	YES	NO
Natural/Logical Consequences	NO	YES	NO
Conflict Resolution			
No-Lose Method	YES	NO	NO
Family Meeting Method	NO	YES	NO
Incentive Programs	NO	NO	YES
Pinpointing/Charting Behavior	NO	NO	YES
Ignoring	NO	YES	YES
Time Out	NO	NO	YES
Goals of Positive and Misbehavior	NO	YES	NO
Family Meetings	NO	YES	NO
Environmental Modification	YES	NO	NO
Modeling Values	YES	NO	NO
Consultation	YES	NO	NO
Modifying Self	YES	NO	NO

* These methods are not taught in the standard Confident Parenting Program but they are promoted and discussed in that program's parent text.

-13-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kerby T.
Alvy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Center for the Improvement of Child Caring
11331 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 103
Studio City, California 91604

CICC

ED274415

PS 015873

TRAINING PARENTING INSTRUCTORS:

A National Model for Training Mental Health, Social
Service and Educational Personnel to Deliver Group
Parent Training Services in their Agencies

by

Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D. and Larry D. Rosen, Ph.D.
Center for the Improvement of Child Caring

January 1984

The work described in this monograph was
supported by grant MH 14384 from the National
Institute of Mental Health and it represents the
final report for that grant.

Center for the Improvement of Child Caring
11331 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 103
Studio City, California 91604

COPYRIGHT

CICC

STUDIO CITY, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.

© JANUARY 1984

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Orienting Issues	3
1. National Significance	3
2. Local Issues	5
3. Program Objectives	7
Chapter Two: Program Descriptions	
1. Choice of Parenting Approaches	11
2. Overview of Expanded Training Model	14
3. Parenting Conference	16
4. Orientation Session	18
5. Intensive Workshops	19
6. Implementation Seminar	33
7. Parent Development Course	37
8. Program Staffing	43
Chapter Three: Program Evaluation	46
1. Pilot Phase	46
Conferences	46
Workshops	50
Follow Up Interviews	53
Refollow Up Longitudinal Interviews	61
2. Expansion Phase	77
Conference	77
Workshops	83
Implementation Seminars	91
Parent Development Courses	93
Follow Up Interviews	97
Chapter Four: Summary and Recommendations	106
References	121
Appendix	125

Acknowledgements

The training program that is described in this work would not have come into existence without grant support from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Several wonderful people within and associated with NIMH were pivotal in shaping the grant proposal and in providing expert consultation, technical assistance, and emotional support. Dr. Sam Silverstein of the Manpower Division provided invaluable assistance in orienting us to the appropriate funding sources within NIMH and to conveying standards of excellence in all of his communications. He oriented us to the Continuing Education Branch for support for the two pilot testing years. The late Dr. Betty Smith of that Branch recognized the merit of the program and helped us to shape a fundable proposal. The three year expansion grant which enabled us to refine and further test the training model was funded through the Experimental and Special Training Branch, after feedback from a special site visit by Dr. Jane Mercer. Then Dr. Silverstein oversaw the three expansion years and continued to provide expert technical assistance.

We at CICC, and the 150 professionals who were trained through this program and the thousands of parents whose relationships with their children were bettered through the services provided by these professionals, are indebted to NIMH and to the sensitive and knowledgeable human beings who evaluated and administered the life-giving grant.

Acknowledgement is also due the sensitive and creative individuals who worked on the program during its first five years. Dr. Howard S. Rubin was a major figure in the development and early evaluation of the program. Drs. Deborah Sears Harrison and Efrain Garza Fuentes continued in these capacities and were particularly helpful in orienting the program to be sensitive to cultural considerations. Several parenting experts delivered effective presentations at the conferences that were part of the program, including Drs. Thomas Gordon, Laura Schrieberman, Robert Aitchison, Richard Royal Kopp and Julie Kuehnel. Drs. Kopp and Kuehnel, and Ms. Kathleen Cornelius served as leaders of the intensive workshops that were the central events of the training program. Drs. Alan Gaus, Alan Spiwack and

Sally McCollum were accomplished and sensitive interviewers of program graduates.

Particular thanks is also given to Drs. Areta Crowell and Rose Jenkins and Mr. Chuck Lewis from the Los Angeles County Mental Health Department for being so supportive, as was Dr. Helen Olander from the California State Health Training Center. Finally, Ms. Connie Dee deserves our appreciation for tolerating the many in-process manuscript revisions that were made and for typing up a very readable document.

INTRODUCTION

Personnel for Parent Development is a multifaceted continuing education program to train professionals who work in mental health, social service and educational agencies to deliver specific types of group parent training services. The program is designed as a national training model (Alvy and Rubin, 1981; 1979).

The types of group parent training services that the program trains these professionals to deliver are educational services that teach parents to employ specialized child management and therapeutic communication skills and which stimulate positive child rearing attitudes. The child rearing attitudes and skills which are taught are similar to those which the research literature on child-parent relations indicates are associated with stable social adjustment and high self-esteem in children (Alvy, 1981; Bigner, 1979; Coopersmith, 1967; Martin, 1975). Stable adjustment and high self-esteem are the hallmarks of mentally healthy children. Thus, because the parent training services are promotive of child rearing attitudes and skills that influence adjustment and self-esteem, the services are considered to be promotive of child mental health. The Personnel for Parent Development Program, then, is a means of training professionals to train parents in skills and attitudes that promote child mental health. The program is a vehicle for disseminating mental health-related parental competencies.

The idea for the program emerged with the founding in 1974 of the Center for the Improvement of Child Caring (CICC), a private, non-profit training, research and community service organization which is located in Los Angeles, California. CICC was founded by mental health professionals and social and behavioral scientists who had a unique consciousness about preventive programming. They set as their goals a series of interrelated projects: the provision and evaluation of a variety of parenting services; the shaping of standard parenting services to make them more relevant and sensitive to ethnic minority families; and the training of instructors to

deliver these services through other community agencies. In addition, CICC had designed several public consciousness-raising projects about child abuse, children's rights and parent training that would take advantage of the media resources in Los Angeles. The strategy was to find appropriate funding sources for these projects, and shape the projects to meet the needs and requirements of the funding sources.

CICC looked to the relevant divisions and branches within the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) for funding of some of these projects. The project to modify standard parenting services for ethnic minority parents was funded by NIMH's Center for Minority Mental Health Programs (Alvy, Fuentes, Harrison and Rosen, 1980). The Personnel for Parent Development Program was funded by the Manpower Division. The five years of grant funding for this training program were from July 1977 to June 1982 and the funds underwrote two years of pilot testing, one year of program refinement and expansion, and two years of field testing of the expanded training model.

This volume provides a comprehensive description and discussion of the five years of NIMH-supported activities for the Personnel for Parent Development Program. It is detailed enough to allow program operators from throughout the United States to replicate the training program in their areas.

The volume begins by indicating the national significance of the program and the local issues that had to be dealt with as it was being created and implemented. The program objectives are indicated, and each aspect of the program including the actual training events are described. The evaluation of each aspect of the program is presented, and the results are discussed in terms of the efficacy and future directions for this type of continuing education program. The program and its results are summarized, and the volume ends with an extensive appendix of documents and materials that are necessary for program replication and evaluation.

CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTING ISSUES

1. National Significance

Over the last decade or so in the mental health and child welfare fields, there has been a convergence of developments, realizations and technological advances that pointed toward the need for a national model for training parenting instructors.

Early in the 1970s the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children stressed the need to establish preventive mental health services such as parent training (Mental Health of Children, 1973). The Joint Commission also stressed the need for innovative training programs for mental health personnel which would enable them to use themselves in new ways of role function, such as being parenting instructors.

In the mid-1970s the Mental Health Services Branch of NIMH commissioned a survey of child mental health authorities for recommendations on improving child mental health (Mitre Corporation, 1977). The authorities represented many disciplines, diverse service delivery settings, and various geographic regions of the country. These authorities rated the types of services that they believed were most important for improving child mental health. Parent training was rated the number one service: "Parents and prospective parents should be specially trained in effective ways of fostering healthy mental-emotional development and in dealing with problems of children. The training must be sensitive to children's developmental stages and to the needs of specific population groups." They further indicated that parent training services should be delivered in all types of service delivery contexts and by a wide variety of human service personnel who should be trained in child development and parent effectiveness.

In the late 1970s the President's Commission on Mental Health, responding in part to the realization that the prevalence of child mental health disorders far exceeds the personnel and resources for dealing with them, also advocated for preventative programming in the child mental health area (President's Commission on Mental Health, 1978).

Developments in the child welfare field also shed a new light on parent training services. With the passage of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974, our country clearly acknowledged the widespread abuse and neglect of children by their parents. While the psychological, social, economic and political causes of abuse and neglect are complex and interactive, nearly all child welfare authorities agree that one of the major contributors is that most parents who abuse or neglect their children have never personally experienced or been trained in positive and non-violent child rearing methods (Alvy, 1975; Fontana, 1973; Gil, 1973; Helfer and Kempe, 1974, 1976). This led many of these persons to advocate for parent training as a child abuse prevention strategy. Publications from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (DHEW, 1976 a,b,c) and the Child Abuse Council of the Education Commission of the States (1976) reflect this outlook. In addition, persons who ran treatment programs for abusive families came to realize that unless they also dealt directly with the parent's distorted child rearing practices the treatment would be incomplete (Justice and Justice, 1976; Martin, 1976). Thus, parent training services became a necessary component of child abuse treatment programs, as well as a highly regarded community strategy for preventing abusive child rearing in the first place.

Coinciding with this strong interest in parent training was the development of sophisticated technologies for training parents. Programs and approaches were developed that taught parents communication and reinforcement skills which were previously part of the skill domain of professional helpers. A recent review of the empirical research regarding the effects of these skill-training programs has indicated that they do indeed result in positive outcomes for most parents and children (Tavormina, 1980). The research also indicates that there is much to be learned about the differential efficacy of the programs with diverse parent-child populations.

In summary, national interest in parent training was growing over the last decade and a half and the technology out of which a national training model could be fashioned was available. What was needed was an organization that could design and implement a model program and a source to fund it.

2. Local Issues

As CICC was designing the model in 1976 in preparation for the formal grant application to NIMH, it held meetings with representatives from some of the mental health agencies in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles had a variety of public and private mental health agencies that serviced the 7 million residents of the County (federally-funded community mental centers, state mental health offices, county mental health clinics, child guidance clinics, psychiatric hospitals, counseling services, family service agencies, etc.). These agencies served ethnically diverse communities within the geographically sprawling county. The meetings were with directors and administrators from a representative sample of these agencies.

The purpose of the meetings were to determine the degree of knowledge about parent training that existed among the agencies and to find out whether their staffs would be receptive to being trained. With a few notable exceptions, the vast majority of agencies knew very little about parent training. They were even less aware of the particular skill-training programs that CICC would be offering. Thus, it became clear that there would have to be a good deal of educating about the services themselves if the target personnel were to become involved.

Subsequent discussions with mental health agency personnel and administrators revealed several realities and attitudes that would play a major role in the conduct and success of the program. Many of these individuals could not offer full-hearted support. Some of the reasons were monetary, i.e., who was to pay for the parent training services that their staffs would be trained to deliver? There was no provision in their state and county service reimbursement contracts for educational services like parent training and most of their parents were too poor to afford to pay for the services. Some raised ideological arguments whether it was appropriate for treatment agencies to offer parent training. Others were defensive because they said their staffs were already trained to deliver parenting services, though they could not describe the previous training or

the type of parent training services they were offering. Still others were concerned about their agency supporting any one approach to parenting and most were adamantly opposed to behavioral approaches.

CICC also met with representatives of the largest provider of continuing education services for mental health agencies, the Mental Health Training Center that was an arm of the California State Department of Mental Health. They were extremely supportive of the idea for the program. They indicated that they had received several requests for training to deliver parenting services but they were unable to meet them because they did not have a great deal of knowledge or expertise in this area. They wrote a very strong letter to NIMH in support of the grant application and they cooperated fully throughout the program. The other major provider was the Training Section of the County Mental Health Department who, though initially cool to the program, became very involved as the program became a reality.

Neither the Mental Health Training Center nor the County Training Section charged for their continuing education programs. Other providers at universities like UCLA and USC did charge for their courses, though they were not delivering as many programs as either the State or County training agencies.

This information was important because it reflected what mental health agencies and personnel were accustomed to in regard to continuing education. There were ample free opportunities and a variety of well-established providers. CICC would be relatively new provider (it had run a previous program in cooperation with UCLA) and it would be providing a type of continuing education for which the target personnel were not familiar.

Because there was enough support for this new endeavor, CICC was able to put together a program advisory council that consisted of persons from the Mental Health Training Center and representatives of the core mental health disciplines. Their involvement aided in making CICC a legitimate service provider, as did the eventual funding from NIMH.

Another local background matter that is important for understanding what happened with the program once its NIMH funding began

in 1977, is the matter of local support for mental health. While California had become known for its exemplary support for mental health in the late 1960s and early 1970s, that support began to wane toward the end of the decade when this program was being started. Federal support for the community mental health centers was also on the wane. And then in 1978 the tax revolt and Proposition 13 happened. The result was a steady reduction of support for mental health services throughout the period that this program was in existence. The reductions included the closing of mental health centers and clinics, cutbacks in staff positions and a concentration on delivering services to the most disturbed patient populations. In addition, by the time that the five years of NIMH funding for this program ended, the State had also defunded the Mental Health Training Center. These types of reductions were also taking place within the social service and educational fields, the two other fields from which the program drew participants.

Thus, the Personnel for Parent Development Program was created because it met nationally recognized training and service needs. Yet it was being implemented at a time when public support for service and training was diminishing. These realities helped shape the program's objectives during its two years of pilot testing, its year of program refinement and expansion, and its two years of field testing of the expanded training model.

3. Program Objectives

In indicating the changes in program objectives that occurred between the pilot testing years and the expansion years, some results from the pilot test years will be mentioned. There were five basic objectives for the two years of pilot testing:

1. To introduce mental health professionals to the major parent training approaches and to the child-parent research literature that supports the use of these approaches. This was to be accomplished by conducting a one day conference on parent training approaches that would also stimulate the participants to want to be trained to

deliver the parenting services of the particular approaches.

2. To provide mental health professionals with the information and skills to enable them to develop and/or refine their abilities to deliver parent training services to groups of parents in their agencies. This was to occur through intensive workshops where the professionals would be taught to apply the parenting curriculum of a specific parent training approach.

3. To have the conference and workshop participants or their agencies share in the training costs by paying conference and workshop enrollment fees.

4. To determine if the training model (conference-plus-intensive-workshops) is well-adapted to the needs and characteristics of mental health personnel from diverse service delivery settings, as indicated by the degree of mental health agency/personnel participation in the conference and workshops and their assessments of these experiences.

5. To determine the degree to which mental health professionals utilize the information and skills which they were exposed to and trained in during the conference and workshops, as determined through follow-up interviews with conference and workshop participants regarding their actual utilization of information and skills.

These objectives were accomplished over a two year period where two conference-plus-workshop training cycles took place. The conferences were rather intimate events that were held at a community mental health center and which featured presentations by experts in the parent training approaches. The workshops took place at CICC and consisted of either eight consecutive weeks of training sessions (one half day session per week) or two consecutive weekends of training which were led by experts in each approach. Conference participants were recruited through a variety of means, including mass mailings of conference brochures. Workshop participants were recruited through the conferences as well as through mailings and other recruitment vehicles. The conference and workshop follow-up interviews were conducted through structured telephone sessions shortly after the conferences and within six months after the workshops. All of what was learned through these experiences got expressed in an additional set of objectives for a year of training model re-

finement and expansion and for two years of additional training cycles to field test the expanded training model. These additional objectives consisted of:

1. To determine the longer term utilization of training by the graduates of the first two training cycles. This was accomplished by reinterviewing the graduates.

2. To expand the conference-plus-intensive-workshop model to include (a) a special orientation session between the conference and the workshops, (b) a seminar in how to implement and maintain parent training services in public agencies, and (c) a course in Parent Development and Cultural Issues in Child Rearing. The need for these additional training experiences emerged out of feedback from the workshop trainers and trainees.

3. To determine whether a new training contract would result in greater agency participation and involvement. In addition to charging fees for the conferences and workshops of the pilot training cycles, the training contract was between the individual participants and CICC. Even if their agencies paid the fees (and very few did) there was no formal commitment on the agency's part that they would support the parent training services that their participating staff members would be trained to deliver. As will be indicated, there was tremendous variability in utilization that resulted from lack of agency support.

A change in the training contract, as well as dropping the fees for participation, was seen as a means of addressing this problem. Thus, it was decided not to charge fees for the two years of field testing of the expanded training model and to make the training contract between the agencies and CICC. This was to be accomplished by personally inviting agencies to send representatives to the conference. Agencies that were represented at the conference would be eligible to nominate staff members for the full training and they would have to indicate the types of support that they would provide for their participating staff persons, including a commitment to support those persons in running parenting groups.

4. To conduct two expanded training cycles, the first of which would be directed at mental health agencies and the second at early

childhood education agencies. It was felt that only one cycle of the expanded model needed to be directed at mental health agencies and that it would make good sense to see if the expanded model could be utilized in training personnel who are not thought of as part of the traditional mental health service delivery system. Thus, the second expanded cycle was to be directed at nursery school, child care and day care personnel. It was thought that if these personnel could be trained effectively through this model, they would be able to deliver the parenting services to parents whose children are enrolled in their early childhood programs. This would mean that the services would be directed at populations that have not been identified as needing mental health services and therefore the parent training services would be utilized in a primary preventive manner.

CHAPTER TWO: PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The expanded training model consisted of several training events: conferences to showcase parent training approaches, orientation sessions for professionals who seek training in the approaches, intensive workshops to learn the approaches, seminars in how to implement the approaches in public agencies, and courses in Parent Development and Cultural Issues in Child Rearing.

Before describing each of these training events, the rationale for choosing the specific parenting approaches will be presented, and a discussion of the practical issues that surrounded the design and implementation of the expanded training model will occur.

1. Choice of Parenting Approaches

Parent training services are educational activities to change parental role performance in order to enhance both parent and child development (Alvy and Rubin, 1981, 1979). Services which are based on a particular theory or theoretical orientation are considered to be parent training approaches. There are different versions of each approach.

In the mental health field, parent training services are primarily designed to enhance the child's social and emotional development. There are at least six approaches: the psychoanalytically-oriented Child Study Association of America approach (Auerback, 1967), the Rational Emotive Therapy approach (Ellis & Grieger, 1977), the Transactional Analytic approach (Bry, 1976; James, 1974, 1977), an approach which owes its heritage to Rogerian psychology (Carkhuff & Bierman, 1970; Gordon, 1970, 1975, 1976; Guerney, 1964), an approach which emerges from Adlerian psychology (Corsini & Painter, 1975; Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1976; Driekurs, 1964; Driekurs & Gray, 1968), and the Social Learning or Behavioral approach (Becker, 1971; Eimers & Aitchison, 1977; Miller, 1975; Patterson, 1971, 1975, 1976).

Versions of the latter three approaches were chosen to be taught in the program. Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) which owes its human relationship philosophy and some of the skills which it teaches to the Rogerian tradition was chosen (Gordon, 1970, 1975, 1976). The PET service is delivered as an eight-week course for groups of parents in which they are taught a variety of therapeutic communication and problem-solving skills. Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) which is grounded in Adlerian ideas was chosen (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1976). The nine-week STEP course teaches groups of parents the Adlerian philosophy of parenthood and of child misbehaviors, and a set of skills for promoting child self-worth and managing misbehaviors. Two versions of the social learning approach were chosen: Systematic Parent Training which teaches the behavioral orientation, principles and reinforcement techniques for use primarily with individual families (Miller, 1975) and Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training which relies more heavily on social reinforcement techniques and which is taught to groups of parents (Aitchison & Liberman, 1973; Eimers & Aitchison, 1977). The former version was used in the first training cycle during the pilot testing and the latter in all other training cycles.

The array of parenting skills which each version teaches are displayed in Table 1.

These versions were selected because they met certain replication criteria. Since the entire program was designed as a national

TABLE 1

COMPARISONS OF PARENT TRAINING PROGRAMS:

PARENTING METHODS TAUGHT

<u>METHODS</u>	<u>PET</u>	<u>STEP</u>	<u>CP</u>
Verbal Appreciation			
Behavior-Specific Praise	NO	NO	YES
Encouragement	NO	YES	NO
Positive I-Messages	YES	NO	NO
Confrontation			
Confrontive I-Messages	YES	YES	NO
Disapproval	NO	NO	YES
Therapeutic Listening	YES	YES	NO*
Self-Disclosure	YES	YES	NO*
Feeling Identification	YES	YES	NO
Problem Ownership	YES	YES	NO
Exploring Alternatives	NO	YES	NO
Natural/Logical Consequences	NO	YES	NO
Conflict Resolution			
No-Lose Method	YES	NO	NO
Family Meeting Method	NO	YES	NO
Incentive Programs	NO	NO	YES
Pinpointing/Charting Behavior	NO	NO	YES
Ignoring	NO	YES	YES
Time Out	NO	NO	YES
Goals of Positive and Misbehavior	NO	YES	NO
Family Meetings	NO	YES	NO
Environmental Modification	YES	NO	NO
Modeling Values	YES	NO	NO
Consultation	YES	NO	NO
Modifying Self	YES	NO	NO

* These methods are not taught in the standard Confident Parenting Program but they are promoted and discussed in that program's parent text.

model, the versions had to be of such a nature that communities throughout the United States could employ them. We applied three replication criteria. First, a version had to have an already established curriculum and methodology for training parents. This meant that the version had to have undergone field testing and had to have produced training manuals and materials for parents. Second, it had to have an already established curriculum and methodology for training parent trainers. This meant that the originators had to have conducted trainings of trainers and had to have produced manuals and materials for trainers. The third criterion had to do with personnel. It had to have been in existence long enough to have generated qualified persons in different parts of the country who could serve as trainers of trainers.

The versions met these criteria. All had field tested manuals for parents and trainers, and each was associated with a national organization that could serve as a resource for finding trainers of trainers in different parts of the country (American Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Effectiveness Training Incorporated, and the North American Society for Adlerian Psychology).

2. Overview of Expanded Training Model

A major practical issue in designing the training model was to balance the need for very specific and in-depth training with the availability and energies of the participants. The vast majority of participants were employed full time in public agencies. If the training was too extensive, it would rule out some participants who could not get away for an extensive training. If the training was nothing more than a brief introduction, it was unlikely that the participants would gain enough to become adequate parenting instructors.

The issue of when to schedule the actual training events also had implications for participation and quality control. If the events were scheduled for weekday working hours, the participants would have to obtain release time or work out some other compensatory time arrangement. If they were on non-working hour times or days, they cut into recreational and family time. The sequencing of the

training events was also an issue. Should all the training take place before the participants are expected to deliver a parenting service? Given the multiple training events of the expanded model, was it practical to have all the events occur before service delivery? What would be the effect of having some training events take place after the participants begin delivering the service? Would those events be given less attention because the participants were more focused on delivering the service?

A related issue was credit and certification for training. Every effort was made to obtain continuing education credits for all of the professions that were involved. CICC was successful in obtaining the credits from the appropriate state organizations for psychologists, clinical social workers and nurses. It was unable to obtain credit for psychiatrists because the medical credit-granting group required that physicians be involved in the delivery of the training events and there were no physicians who were qualified to conduct the events. For those who might need college credit for the training (the early childhood education personnel) CICC was prepared to do whatever might be necessary if the participant found a receptive college or university. In terms of certification, CICC made available a certificate that indicated the number of hours of training that were completed in learning a particular parenting approach. This was only made available to those who were enrolled in the intensive workshops and the other post conference events. The Effectiveness Training organization also supplied their own certificate for those who completed the P.E.T. workshops.

An overriding practical issue was the time frame within the year for scheduling an entire training cycle. The expanded training model had a six month span of training events (from the one day conference through the end of the Parent Development Course) and a six month period where the graduates were expected to conduct their first parenting groups. At the end of that time, the graduates were to be interviewed regarding their actual uses of their training. The decision of when to schedule the entire cycle was based on a range of considerations having to do with the potential availability of conference participants, the time needed for an

agency to decide if it was worth their while to nominate staff, enough training time to prepare the trainees to begin parenting groups, the times of the year when it may be easier to obtain parental participation in such groups, and the availability of qualified persons to conduct the various training events. On the basis of these considerations, the training events were held from July through January and the trainees were expected to run their first groups between February and June. This schedule seemed to work very well for the mental health and social service personnel but less so for the early education personnel. Many of the early education people were on an academic calender with summers off. Hence they were relatively unavailable for a summer conference. This meant that we ran the cycle for these personnel without a conference.

A complete description of the scheduling of all of the training events for the expanded training model cycles (1980 and 1981) are in the Appendix. The schedules are part of documents that explained each training cycle. Included in these documents are overviews about the training model, a description of all the training events, a discussion and delineation of nomination and selection issues and criteria, and copies of the nomination forms that were to be completed by both the nominated staff member and the nominating administrator, director or service head. The 1980 document was given to the participants at that cycle's conference, and the 1981 document was mailed out to all of the early childhood education agencies in Los Angeles County.

These are major reference documents for the training model and for the specifics of each training event (times, dates, leaders, etc.). Because of the availability of these documents, the following descriptions of each training event will be restricted to indicating the curricula and the methods of evaluation which were used.

3. Parenting Conference

The Program Director introduced the one day conference and oriented everyone to its purpose. The conference evolved around presentations on the parenting approaches by recognized professional experts, and a

panel discussion among the experts regarding the differences and similarities in the approaches. The use of expert presenters was based on the finding that learning from outside experts is a preferred learning mode among community mental health professionals (Estes, 1975).

The expert presenters were given 75 minutes to deliver a presentation and handle questions from the audience. Their presentations were to cover (1) the history and theoretical foundations of the approach, (2) a description of the approach, including goals, training methods and parenting ideas and skills taught, (3) the applicability of the approach with diverse parent populations, and (4) how the approach could be utilized as part of an agency's overall community services. Two presentations occurred in the morning and the third after the lunch break. The panel discussion took place after the afternoon presentation. It was moderated by the Program Director who screened questions from the audience by having them submitted on cards and who proposed various questions such as asking each presenter how a parent who was trained in their approach would handle a typical child rearing problem. After the panel discussion was completed, the conference participants were again oriented how they could apply to be trained in one of the approaches.

The conferences for the two pilot phase training cycles were structured exactly as indicated, and audio tapes of the first conference were made (Alvy, 1977). The conference for the first expanded training cycle had an additional feature. During the panel discussion, graduates of the first two training cycles joined the panelists and shared their experiences in being trained in the approaches and in using them in their agencies. The invitation for this conference is displayed in the Appendix.

At each conference, there was a book area where participants could browse and buy the latest books and pamphlets on parent training, child development and child abuse. At the pilot phase conferences the participants received a great deal of free reading materials in their conference packets about these subject areas. At the expanded phase conference the participants only received the previously mentioned document.

The pilot phase conferences were evaluated by having the participants complete an evaluation form before they left the conference and by completing a brief telephone follow-up interview three months after the conference. These procedures yielded data on who the participants were, their previous knowledge and experiences with parent training, and their reactions to and utilization of the various aspects of the conference. The number of conference participants who enrolled in the subsequent workshops was also used as an evaluation index.

The expanded phase conference was evaluated by having the participants fill out the conference evaluation form, and by noting how many of the agencies who were represented at the conference actually nominated staff members for the full training cycle.

4. Orientation Session

During the pilot testing years there was no orientation session before the intensive workshops began. There were such sessions during the two expansion years. These sessions were for all of the trainees who were selected into the program for each cycle.

The main purpose of the orientation session was to clarify the training agreement (see Appendix) which included that the trainees were expected to conduct parent training groups in their agencies. In addition, the full training cycle was described and the evaluation requirements for each training event were specified. Trainees were informed that in order to receive continuing education credits and certification they needed to complete all of the evaluation requirements (exams, etc.) for the intensive workshops, the implementation seminar and the parent development course.

These types of clarifications took place during the first hour of this two-hour session, which was led by the Program Director. All of the trainees took part and they were introduced to all of the personnel to whom they would be relating (program evaluators, workshop leaders, etc.).

During the second hour, the trainees were formed into their actual workshop groups. This allowed them to get to know their leaders and each other. Each leader prepared a short statement or

training exercise to orient them to their workshops, and each leader handed out the workshop's training manuals.

Everyone left this session having a clearer understanding of what was expected of them and who they would be working with.

5. Intensive Workshops

The intensive workshops in the three parenting approaches differed in terms of format and amount of training, but were similar in most other respects. Each workshop was for ten trainees and was led by one leader or trainer. Each workshop consisted of several basic training sessions to learn the approach, and two supervision sessions which took place one and two months after the basic training sessions. The supervision sessions were to assist the participants in running their first parent training group.

The workshops were evaluated through several procedures which served a variety of purposes. The basic purpose was to determine whether the workshops were successful in teaching the ideas and skills that were necessary to run parent training groups. We referred to this purpose as Skill Development and it was evaluated by having the trainees take an examination at the end of the basic training sessions on the theory, methods and use of the particular parent training program. Skill Development was also evaluated by having the workshop trainers indicate the degree to which trainees had demonstrated the knowledge, attitudes and skills to conduct the structured parenting program of their particular approach.

A second major purpose was to determine the degree to which the trainees made use of their training to actually deliver community services. We referred to this as Skill Utilization and it was evaluated through an extensive telephone follow-up interview that took place three to six months after the last supervision session. This follow-up interview was also used to obtain information on the type of agency support that they actually got for parent training, their attitudes toward parenting services and other types of human services, and their needs for additional training (see Appendix).

The longitudinal follow-up interviews that were conducted with the pilot phase graduates also included questions about their own needs for implementing parent training programs and the child development information needs which parents who they had trained had expressed or reflected. This information was used as a basis for creating the Implementation Seminar and the Parent Development Class for the expanded training cycles.

These longitudinal follow-up interviews, as well as the regular follow-up interviews that took place with the graduates of the expanded training cycles, also included questions about which parents that the graduates had trained had benefitted most or least from their parent training program.

As has been indicated, the intensive workshops themselves differed in terms of format and amount of training. The format for the Confident Parenting Workshop was three days of basic training sessions and two half days of supervision sessions. These consumed a total of twenty two and a half training hours. The format for the Adlerian (STEP) workshop was eight half days of basic training sessions and two half days of supervision sessions, totaling approximately twenty five training hours. The P.E.T. workshop had five full days of basic training sessions and two half days of supervision sessions for a total of approximately forty one training hours.

Each session of each workshop was carefully structured in terms of training objectives, content and methods. This was done to provide a model for how the parent training programs which they were being taught to deliver should be structured and conducted. The workshop leader or trainer also modeled the program's skills in how he or she conducted the intensive workshops.

The curriculum for each workshop is shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4. They indicate the training objectives, content and methods that were employed in each session of each workshop.

The trainees in each workshop received the basic materials that would allow them to conduct a parenting group. For the trainees in the Confident Parenting workshop, the materials consisted of a copy of the book that parents were to receive (Eimers and Aitchison's

TABLE 2

CONFIDENT PARENTING WORKSHOP CURRICULUM

Session I - 5½ Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

- Objectives: 1. Provide orientation and overview of Confident Parenting Workshop methods and assumptions.
2. Participants will acquire the skills necessary to conduct Sessions I and II of Confident Parenting Workshop.
- Content: 1. Overview of workshop format
2. Parents as teachers
3. Defining and targeting behaviors
4. Giving data taking assignments to parents
5. The components of Praise
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Film "Who Did What to Whom"
3. Modeling and demonstration of skills
4. Roleplay and practice of skills
5. Homework assignment: Praise child, spouse or co-worker 3 times per day, read chpts. 1,2,3 in Effective Parents/Responsible Children.

Session II - 5½ Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

- Objectives: 1. Participants will acquire the skills necessary to conduct Session III of the workshop.
- Content: 1. Mild Social Punishment
2. Ignoring
3. Time Out
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Modeling and demonstration of skills
3. Roleplay and practice by participants
4. Homework assignment: Read Chpts. 4,5,6 in Effective Parents/Responsible Children, work with parents in caseload individually using the four techniques

Session III - 5½ Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break - Includes Examination (See Appendix)

- Objectives: 1. Participants will acquire the skills to conduct Session IV of the workshop
- Content: 1. Review use of four basic techniques
2. Overview of special incentive systems
3. Increasing positive reciprocity between parent and adolescent
4. Getting a group started

CONFIDENT PARENTING CURRICULUM - Cont.

Session III Cont.

- Methods:
1. Review homework assignments
 2. Roleplay case examples
 3. Lecture
 4. Roleplay and practice
 5. Discussion
 6. Homework assignment. Get a group started (sign ups), read remainder of book

Session IV - 3 Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. Participants will learn skills involved in working with groups
- Content:
1. How to facilitate roleplaying by parents
 2. Facilitating parent participation
 3. Contracting for parent attendance
- Methods:
1. Lecture
 2. Demonstration
 3. Roleplay/practice by participants
 4. Discussion
 5. Homework: Begin group

Session V - 3 Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. Troubleshoot and pick up "loose ends"
- Content:
1. Problems and successes brought by participants from their cases and groups.
- Methods:
1. Discussion
 2. Roleplay problems
 3. Reinforce efforts

TABLE 3

STEP - ADLERIAN WORKSHOP CURRICULUM

Session I - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Develop group cohesion
2. Orient participants to the objectives of the training
- Content: 1. Group introduction exercise
2. Learning participants' names
3. Overview of the sessions
4. Assignment of the reading and exercises for next week
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Group discussion
3. Group exercise

Session II - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Learn how to understand children's misbehavior
2. Learn how to appreciate positive behavior
3. Learn how to withdraw from power conflicts
- Content: 1. The four goals of misbehavior
2. Showing mutual respect
3. Social equality and parenting
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Role-playing
3. Group discussion
4. Audio tapes

Session III - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Learn the distinction between a "good" and a "responsible" parent
2. Learn the relationship between emotions and behavior
3. Learn the relationship between birth position and personality
4. Learn how to give choices while being firm and friendly with children
5. Learn the importance of avoiding controlling, dominating, overprotecting or pitying children
- Content: 1. Consequences of being a "good" parent
2. Consequences of being a "responsible" parent
3. Birth order
4. How to be firm without dominating or controlling
5. How to give choices and be friendly without overprotecting or pitying

STEP CURRICULUM - Cont.

Session III Cont.

- Methods:
1. Lecture
 2. Role-playing
 3. Group discussion
 4. Audio tapes

Session IV - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. Learn how to encourage children
 2. Learn the potential dangers of reward and punishment
 3. Learn the dangers of discouragement and competition

- Content:
1. Encouragement and the child's strengths
 2. Encouragement and the child's effort and improvement
 3. Encouragement and acceptance of the child
 4. Praise in contrast with encouragement

- Methods:
1. Lecture
 2. Group discussion
 3. Group exercises
 4. Role-Playing
 5. Audio tapes

Session V - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. Learn effective methods of communication
 2. Some typical parenting roles and their negative efforts
 3. Learning effective listening skills

- Content:
1. Reflective listening
 2. Open vs. closed responses
 3. Words which express negative and positive feelings
 4. Maladaptive parenting roles

- Methods:
1. Lecture
 2. Role-playing
 3. Group discussion
 4. Audio tapes
 5. Group exercises
 6. Practice leading the group

Session VI - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. Learn how to problem-solve with children
 2. Learn how to use "I-messages" instead of "You-messages"
 3. Learn how to determine who "owns" the problem

STEP CURRICULUM - Cont.

Session VI Cont.

- Content: 1. Six steps in exploring solutions to conflicts
2. The negative impact of "You-messages"
3. How to deliver "I-messages"
4. How to determine who "owns" the problem
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Role-playing
3. Group discussion
4. Audio tapes
5. Practice leading the group

Session VII - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Learn the distinction between punishment and logical consequences
2. Learn how to apply natural consequences
3. Learn how to apply logical consequences
- Content: 1. Natural and logical consequences
2. Steps in applying logical consequences
3. Shared decision-making
4. Acting in a firm but kind manner
5. Selecting the appropriate approach
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Role-playing
3. Group discussion
4. Audio tapes
5. Practice leading the group

Session VIII - 2½ Training Hours - Includes Examination

- Objectives: 1. Learn how to run a family meeting
2. Building self-confidence
3. Begin planning to start a study group
- Content: 1. The family meeting: its function and rationale
2. How to organize and run a family meeting
3. Starting a group in your agency or community setting: Adlerian parent study
 --initial presentation to staff or parents
 --group composition
 --getting parents and staff support
- Methods: 1. Lecture
2. Role-playing
3. Group discussion
4. Audio tapes
5. Practice leading the group
- Examination: A written examination covering the major concepts and skills of the workshop is given (see Appendix).

STEP CURRICULUM - Cont.

Session IX - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Facilitate implementation of Adlerian parent study groups
2. Apply content to the specific needs for each agency or group
- Content: 1. Feedback from participants about progress made in starting groups
2. Problem-solving to overcome obstacles to starting groups
- Methods: 1. Group discussion
2. Problem-solving techniques

Session X - 2½ Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. Facilitate implementation of Adlerian parent study groups
2. Apply content to the specific needs for each agency or group
- Content: 1. Feedback from participants about progress made in starting groups
2. Problem-solving to overcome obstacles to starting groups
- Methods: 1. Group discussion
2. Problem-solving techniques

TABLE 4

PARENT EFFECTIVENESS TRAINING WORKSHOP CURRICULUM

Session I - 7 Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

- Objectives:
1. To provide the participants with specific information about the
 - a.) Parent Effectiveness Course
 - b.) Instructor workshop
 - c.) Group
 - d.) Trainer
 - e.) Schedule
 - f.) Materials
 2. To strengthen the effectiveness of the instructor training experience by clarifying expectations of all involved.
 3. To develop an accepting atmosphere for learning and participation to take place.
 4. To explore the basic concepts of the Parent Effectiveness Course, as specifically found in the first 3 sessions, namely:
 - a.) Behaviors - and our response
 - b.) Acceptance - non-acceptance
 - c.) Problem ownership
 - d.) The communication process
 - e.) Being an effective helping agent

- Content:
1. General acclimation
 2. Brief introduction to history of P.E., Tom Gordon
 3. Get-acquainted exercises
 4. Expectations exercise
 5. Schedule: time, course sequence, follow-up
 6. Materials: what they are, when to use
 7. University of LaVerne credit
 8. Care and comfort (logistics of survival)
 - ***
 9. Looking at the specific behaviors of others (our children, adult relationships, etc.)
 10. "Labeling" exercise
 11. Diagram of acceptance/non-acceptance of others behaviors
 12. Problem ownership
 13. Overview of skills to be covered in P.E.

P.E.T. CURRICULUM - Cont.

14. Being an effective helping agent:
 - { Roadblocks to avoid
 - { Facilitative communication
 - { Attending
 - { Simple acknowledgement
 - { Door-openers
 - { Feedback
 - { Active listening exercises
 - { Group
 - { Group
 - { Triads and dyads
 - { Current abuses of listening "skill"
15. Closure

Methodology: The arena of learning the Parent Effectiveness Course and the teaching of that course will include:

1. Lecture
2. Discussion, small group and total group
3. Experiential exercises, small group and total group
4. Skill practice, small group and total group
5. Workbook exercises
6. Some text reading
7. Small group (5) Instructor practice-teaching
8. "Outside, real-life" skill practice
9. On going input or feedback

Material of the day found in Parent Effectiveness Instructor Guide, Sessions I, II, and III; and in PET workbook, pages 1 to 23.

Session II - 7 Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

- Objectives:
1. To focus on the use of "I-messages" and listening as vehicles for enhancing relationships in the "no-problem" area.
 2. To develop an accepting atmosphere for risk-taking and self-disclosure.
 3. To present the construct of the confrontive I-message, and provide experiences that allow I-messages to be operative.

- Content:
1. Review behavior rectangle - to "No-problem" area
 2. Focus on "No problem" area as a time for enriching parent-child relationship
 3. 'Self-disclosing' I-message exercise
 4. 'Responsive' I-message exercise
 5. 'Preventive' I-message exercise
 6. 'Positive' I-message assignment

P.E.T. CURRICULUM - Cont.

Content Cont.

7. Review behavior rectangle - to "Parent owns problem area"
8. Lecture (brief) on options among skills when (I) parent owns problem
9. Exercise to experience roadblocks (you-messages) when parent has unmet need
10. Exercise to form and polish 3-part I-message (group)
11. Exercise to form and polish 2 and 3-part confrontive I-messages (small groups)
12. Active-listening as used to prevent misunderstanding of my confrontive I-message, and/or to ascertain conflicts of need
13. Exercise: Practice in sending I-message of genuine 'real-life' problem
14. Assign and discuss
 - a.) Expectations of Instructor Practice
 - b.) Timing of Instructor Practice
 - c.) Grouping (5's) for Instructor Practice
 - d.) Vehicle for evaluation of Instructor Practice
 - e.) Segments from P.E. Instructor Guide to be taught
 - f.) Options to segments outlined
15. Closure

Methodology: Same as that outlined for Session I.

Session III - 7 Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

Objectives:

1. To provide a simulated teaching experience for participants.
2. To experience P.E. materials as outlined, and as adapted to specific groups.
3. To underline modification of the environment as a viable option for problem-solving.
4. To explore several problem-solving modes and their dependence on power/force as a motivator.
5. To experience power/force and the subsequent feelings it elicits.
6. To present Method III problem-solving as an effective tool in conflicts of needs.

Content:

1. Instructor Practice (small groups)
2. Input and coaching of Instructors
- ***
3. Review behavior rectangle to date
4. Exercise - modification of environment
5. Lecture - conflict of needs
6. Exercise - Power and problem-solving
7. Discussion - Power usage, good and bad aspects

P.E.T. Curriculum - Cont.

- Content Cont.
8. Method III presentation {Lecture
Instructor tape
 9. Role-play (fishbowl)
Steps I and II of Method III problem-solving
 - ***
 10. Assign components of next Instructor Practice
 11. Closure

Methodology: Same as that outlined for Session I.

Session IV - 7 Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break

- Objectives:
1. To provide a simulated teaching experience for participants.
 2. To provide further opportunity for participants to gain ease with materials, content and their own capabilities to facilitate a Parent Effectiveness class.
 3. To teach Method III problem-solving skills, providing practical application.
 4. To acknowledge the stresses and emotionladen pressures of values conflicts.
 5. To begin to look at influence skills as a problem-solver in values conflicts.

- Content:
1. Instructor Practice (small groups)
 2. Input and coaching as needed
 - ***
 3. Role-play of Method III problem-solving (triads)
 4. Role-play of Method III problem-solving (5's)
 5. Errors and strategies of Method III - Lecture
 - ***
 6. Review behavior rectangle
 7. Define 'values conflicts' vs. 'values differences'
 8. 3 exercises a.) Values: self-awareness
b.) Experiencing values differences
c.) Experiencing values conflicts (perhaps simulated)
 9. Modeling, as a "skill" - lecture
 10. Modeling - "Cat's in the Cradle" song - discussion
 - ***
 11. Assign components of next Instructor Practice
 12. Review expectations of Instructor Test
 13. Closure

Methodology: Same as outlined for Session I.

P.E.T. CURRICULUM - Cont.

Session V - 7 Training Hours, 1 Hour Lunch Break - Includes Examination

- Objectives:
1. To provide a simulated teaching experience for participants.
 2. To provide further opportunity for participants to gain ease with materials, content and their own capabilities to facilitate a Parent Effectiveness class.
 3. To present and practice influence skills in the area of parent-child values conflicts.
 4. To administer the Instructor test of course content.
 5. To create a supportive atmosphere for Instructors to begin their classes.

- Content:
1. Instructor practice (small groups)
 2. Input and coaching of Instructors as needed

3. Problem-solving behavior - lecture
4. Consulting - in values conflicts - lecture
5. Exercise (small groups) in consulting
6. Role-play of consulting skill
7. Modification of Self vs. power
8. Exercise - modifying self
9. Review behavior rectangle
10. Closure of course

11. Relating to Effectiveness Training { Support
Business
Other courses

Closure

Methodology: Same as outlined for Session I.

Examination: A written examination covering the major concepts and skills at the workshop is given (see Appendix).

Session VI - 3 Training Hours

- Objectives:
1. To assess needs of Instructors as it relates to implementation of teaching P.E. course.
 2. To provide practical meeting of those special needs.
 3. To further provide insights into the teaching of low income or non-reading parents.

- Content:
1. Input from Instructors
 2. Small group discussion
 3. Brainstorming needs
 4. Exercises, practice, Trainer input, etc., as determined by needs assessment

P.E.T. CURRICULUM - Cont.

- Content Cont. 5. 2 experimental exercises to teach 1.) listening and 2.) I-messages without use of written material of any kind
6. Closure

Methodology: Discussion, brainstorming, prioritizing needs as a group.
Further methodology determined as needs determined.

Session VII - 3 Training Hours

- Objectives: 1. To assess needs of Instructors as it relates to implementation of teaching P.E. course.
2. To provide practical meeting of those special needs.
3. To provide insights and support to Instructors in teaching Parent Effectiveness classes.

- Content: 1. Input from Instructors
2. Small group discussion/brainstorming needs
3. Exercises, practice, Trainer input, etc., as determined by needs assessment

Methodology: Discussion, brainstorming, prioritizing needs as a group. Further methodology determined as needs determined.

Effective Parents/Responsible Children: A Guide to Confident Parenting, 1977, which is available in paperback from McGraw Hill) and the instructor's manual (Aitchison's Confident Parenting Workshop Leader's Guide, 1976, which is available through CICC). For the trainees in the STEP-Adlerian workshops, they received the entire STEP Kit which contained the parent's workbook and the leader's manual as well as all of the audio tapes, posters and other training materials that support this program (the STEP Kit is available through American Guidance Service, Inc., 1976, Circle Pines, Minnesota). The P.E.T. trainees received the entire kit of materials (parent's workbook, instructor's guide and resource book, P.E.T. training exercise materials, etc.) that support the regular P.E.T. instructor training workshops that are run by Effectiveness Training, Inc. (Solano Beach, California).

The trainees and their agencies were responsible for obtaining the number of parent workbooks that would be needed for their actual classes. They could purchase the Confident Parenting and STEP workbooks from McGraw Hill or American Guidance, respectively. Or they could purchase them through CICC. In regard to P.E.T. materials for parents, there was a special arrangement. The Effectiveness Training organization charges a proprietary fee for each parent who takes a class which is run by a certified P.E.T. instructor. The fee covers the costs of the parent's workbook and the other training materials which the parents receive, as well as a proprietary charge. The usual fee is \$25 per parent but a special arrangement was made for this program and the materials were made available through CICC.

The trainees and their agencies were oriented toward several strategies for paying for the parent materials, all of which were discussed in the Implementation Seminar.

6. Implementation Seminar

In developing the curriculum for the seminar, the feedback which the program had received from the pilot phase graduates was

carefully examined. Some of these graduates were very successful in mobilizing agency support for running parenting classes and in generating such classes within their agencies. Some were also successful in generating and conducting classes on a private basis with local churches, temples or preschools. Most of the graduates, however, were not successful in mobilizing agency support or generating classes. We listened carefully as we received this feedback for both the areas of primary difficulty and for instances of success.

We consulted with the Effectiveness Training organization since they had had over a decade of experience in assisting P.E.T. instructors in the generation of classes. They had well-established guidelines and procedures for recruitment and advertising. Most of their work, however, was directed toward instructors who were not affiliated with agencies and they did not have guidelines that were particular to agency-based personnel. We also consulted the research literature on parent training and found some helpful procedures for eliciting and maintaining parental participation, especially from researchers who had utilized behavioral parent training programs (Cobb and Medway, 1978).

Also consulted were administrators of major mental health programs, such as administrators in the County Mental Health Department. Their feedback and knowledge was very important in terms of developing guidelines on how public mental health agencies might describe group parent training services so that they would fit already existing categories of service and possibly allow for reimbursement through contractual arrangements.

The other major source for developing the seminar curriculum was CICC's extensive experiences in conducting parent training classes. Since most of CICC's experiences were in the area of conducting classes in cooperation with other agencies and organizations, it had the most to say on these types of classes.

One of the overriding needs that emerged out of all of these curriculum development activities was the need for a terminology that would encompass the variety of parenting classes that could

be conducted within and outside of agencies, and a delineation of the issues that were particular to each class type. The resultant curriculum attempted to meet these needs.

The curriculum covered five basic areas:

1. Parent Training Classes in Agencies
 - A. Types of Classes
 - B. Objectives of Classes
2. Gaining Agency Support for Parent Training Classes
 - A. Basic Principles
 - B. Issues, Concerns, Objections, and Resistances of Agencies
3. Generating Classes
 - A. General Ideas
 - B. Client Service Classes
 - C. Community Service Classes
 - D. Co-Sponsored Classes
 - E. Newspapers
 - F. Television and Radio
 - G. Community Group Speeches
 - H. Utilizing Current Participants
4. Issues in Conducting Classes
 - A. Taking Care of Basics Beforehand (space, materials, child care, transportation, contact persons, policy on guests, etc.)
 - B. Group Issues: Size, Composition
 - C. Orientation Meetings
 - D. Maintaining Participation and Attendance
 - E. Referring Parents/Children to Other Services
 - F. Graduation and Certificates
 - G. Follow-Up, Advanced and Continuing Classes
5. Funding of Parent Training Classes
 - A. Client Service Classes and Parent Fees
 - B. Community Service Classes and Parent Fees

C. Single Class Funding

D. Grant Funding

The curriculum for each of these areas is summarized in the Implementation Seminar document in the Appendix. This document was created in response to feedback from the seminar that took place in the first expanded training cycle. That seminar lasted an entire day and the participants said it could be shortened and made more impactful if a document on the issues was prepared and distributed in advance of the seminar. The seminar for the second expanded cycle was for a half day and the document was distributed beforehand.

The Program Director, who had written the document, led the seminar. The first part of the seminar consisted of a complete review of the document, area by area. The participants had been alerted to review each area and to bring in questions. For example, if they were not clear on the distinction between client service and community service classes, or if they needed specific help in dealing with some form of agency resistance, they raised these questions when the relevant area was reviewed. The Program Director either clarified the issue himself, oriented the questioner to draw on the workshop experience that was relevant to dealing with the issue, and/or opened the question to the entire group.

The second part of the seminar consisted of a practical exercise in what is involved in implementing parent training classes. The participants were handed a three page form entitled Plan for Generating and Maintaining Parent Training Classes (see Appendix). The participants were the trainees from all three workshops and an administrator or service head from their agencies. They were asked to pair up and complete the form. After everyone had done this, the group reconvened as a whole and another round of questions and answers took place. The seminar ended with the filling out of an evaluation form (see Appendix).

7. Parent Development Course

Significant modifications in this course also occurred as a result of trainee feedback in the first expanded training cycle. For the first cycle, the format for the course was twelve half day sessions, one per week. The trainees reported that this was too disruptive to their on-going agency work, especially as it came on the heels of all the absences for the workshop sessions and the implementation seminar. The alternative was to have six full day sessions so that the actual number of days where work was disrupted would be cut in half. The course in the second expanded cycle was for six full days which included breaks for lunch where the trainees and the instructor (the Program Director) could meet informally.

As this type of modification may reflect, there was a particular set of dynamics that operated during the course. The trainees had completed the basic workshop training sessions and were expected to begin their first groups. As can be gleaned from the implementation seminar materials, generating and maintaining parent training groups is a very involved and time-consuming process. Starting ones first group is even more difficult, as one is rarely sure that they are doing things right. Also, if the trainee has not been able to start a group by this time, the trainee may be feeling guilty for not fulfilling his or her end of the training agreement. Thus, the trainees were either feeling overwhelmed or overjoyed with their initial experiences in starting a group or they were feeling uncomfortable over not starting a group. This meant that they were somewhat resistant to taking in new information, or reviewing old information, from this course. This highly understandable dynamic was accommodated not only by changing the format for the second-expanded cycle, but by restructuring the content to make it as practical as possible and leaving time in each session for a discussion of implementation problems.

The curriculum content was developed to meet trainer needs that had been identified during the pilot testing years. Some of these needs were easily anticipated, such as their need to be knowledgeable

about child development stages and processes and about cultural issues in child rearing. As parent trainers they certainly were logical people for parents to relate to over child development information, and as trainers in the culturally diverse Los Angeles County they had to have a grasp on cultural matters in order to relate positively and knowledgeably to different groups. Other needs were more subtle, such as requiring a framework for appreciating all of the functions and demands on parents. The parent training programs only dealt with a restricted range of parental functions. Without an appreciation of the full spectrum the trainers would be less likely to understand why it might be difficult for parents to devote all energies to the functions that the programs addressed.

The content areas that were chosen were (a) a comprehensive model of parental functions, (b) parenting as a process of co-development, (c) child development research that supports the use of the parenting programs, (d) similarities and differences in the programs, (e) cultural issues in child rearing, (f) child abuse and neglect, and (g) a trainer's role in regard to the child development information needs of parents. The Program Director, who had taught courses on these areas at professional schools and universities and who has been a contributor to the theorizing and research in these areas, developed the curriculum and taught the course.

The course began with a question and answer session about what parents actually do. The trainees were asked to give a job description for parents. As they indicated the various functions which parents serve, the instructor wrote these on the chalkboard and organized them into five categories of parental functions (see Table 5). These functions were discussed at considerable length and the trainees were oriented that their programs dealt primarily with the psychological caregiving function. The basic reaction to this content area was to increase or clarify trainee awareness about the potentially overwhelming functions which parents serve. Several trainees reported that they incorporated this presentation into their parenting groups and it helped them to be seen as people

TABLE 5

PARENTAL FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

RESOURCE PROVISION	CARING FOR THE HOME	PROTECTING CHILDREN	PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CAREGIVING OF CHILDREN	ADVOCATING AND INTERFACING
<u>TYPES OF RESOURCES</u> 1. <u>Material</u> (Housing, clothing, furniture, etc.) 2. <u>Nutritional</u> (Food, drink, etc.) 3. <u>Utility</u> (Gas, electric, etc.) 4. <u>Services</u> (Health, educational, etc.) 5. <u>Community</u> (Parks, stores, etc.) 6. <u>Cultural/Recreational</u> (Films, music, art, etc.) 7. <u>Transportation</u> (Autos, bikes, buses, etc.) 8. <u>Communication</u> (T.V., radio, newspapers) <u>RELATED ISSUES</u> Consumption priorities	<u>AREAS OF CARE</u> 1. <u>Home Maintenance</u> (Cleaning, painting, etc.) 2. <u>Clothing Maintenance</u> (Cleaning, washing, etc.) 3. <u>Nutrition Maintenance</u> (Cooking, shopping, etc.) 4. <u>Car Maintenance</u> (Cleaning, repairing, etc.) <u>RELATED TASKS</u> 1. Budgeting 2. Management of funds	<u>TYPES OF HARM REQUIRING PARENTAL PROTECTION</u> 1. Bodily Harm 2. Psychological Harm 3. Peer Harm 4. Social Harm 5. Racial, Ethnic, Spiritual and Cultural Harm <u>RESULT OF LACK OF PARENTAL PROTECTION: CHILD ABUSES</u> 1. Physical abuse and neglect 2. Emotional abuse and neglect 3. Sexual abuse	<u>GUIDENCE OF ALL ASPECTS OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT:</u> 1. Physical 2. Motor 3. Sensory 4. Perceptual 5. Cognitive 6. Linguistic 7. Social 8. Emotional 9. Sexual 10. Moral 11. Spiritual 12. Cultural 13. Educational <u>PHYSICAL CAREGIVING</u> Feeding, cleaning, dressing children, attending to injuries and health needs, etc. <u>PSYCHOLOGICAL CARE-GIVING</u> Nurturing, teaching, communicating, grooming, managing behavior problems, disciplining, enculturating, etc.	<u>ADVOCATING</u> For child <u>before</u> such institutions as the school. <u>INTERFACING</u> Between child and family of origin, extended family, world of work, law enforcement, transportation and other systems. <u>RELATED ISSUES</u> Linking child to above systems and transporting child.

who really understood the pressures and demands of raising children. A discussion of this five part descriptive model is now available in a monograph entitled The Enhancement of Parenting: An Analysis of Parent Training Programs (Alvy, 1981a).

During the course which was taught in the first expanded training cycle, the conceptualization of parenting as a process of co-development consumed much more time than the trainees believed it deserved. The conceptualization is that children and parents develop together, with the child's stage of development influencing how he or she acts and reacts and with the parent's stage of development having similar affects. Taken within the context of the family, the family is seen as a unit of co-developing individuals with reciprocal impact. This conceptualization, which is intended to orient trainees that they need to be aware of both the child's level of development and the parent's adult life stage, is best articulated in the book Parent-Child Relations: An Introduction to Parenting (Bigner, 1979) and in the psychosocial theory of Erik Erikson (1950). During the first expanded cycle, the trainees were required to read most of the Bigner book which was organized on developmental lines. A discussion of the book consumed several training sessions and, while valuable to some trainees, was seen as too elementary by others (especially those with backgrounds in psychoanalytic theory and systems theory).

During the second cycle, the trainees were made aware of this book but the basic idea was communicated through a training exercise which utilized the CICC Family Development Chart (see Appendix).

The trainees were to complete the chart by describing the characteristics of their family of origin when they were born and when they were five, ten and fifteen years of age. They also described their current family situation. They filled out the chart at home when they could reflect on these matters. The completed charts were brought to the next class session and discussed by asking some of the trainees to share their experiences in completing the chart. They were asked if anyone noticed changes in family characteristics or functioning that resulted from their develop-

mental changes or were they treated differently on the basis of changes in family characteristics. This exercise seemed to bring the basic concept to life for most of the trainees. Here again some trainees incorporated this presentation and exercise into their parenting groups and/or delivered it to staff or community groups.

The research literature on child-parent relations that is most pertinent to the parenting programs is the literature on child self-esteem and parental acceptance (Coopersmith, 1967; Martin, 1975). Illustrative research studies and research reviews were presented and discussed. These are also indicated in the monograph, The Enhancement of Parenting (Alvy, 1981a). Some trainees made use of this information in delivering presentations before community groups.

The curriculum content on program differences and similarities is also available in the Enhancement monograph. The discussion of this material helped sharpen the trainees appreciation of their own program as well as helping them to see its limitations. Some trainees reported that they used this material as the basis for staff and community presentations on parent training.

There was not a great deal of useful data and information on cultural issues in child rearing when the expanded training cycles were taking place. However, CICC was in the process of doing a cross-cultural research study (as part of the Culturally-Adapted Parent Training Project) which did provide useful information. Preliminary results on black, white and Mexican-American child rearing practices, images and attitudes were available, as was a synthesis of ideas on black parenting by black parenting scholars (Alvy, K.T. 1981b; Alvy, Harrison, Rosen and Fuentes, 1982). The preliminary results which were shared, and which seemed most helpful, were those that demonstrated a traditional black outlook on disciplining children which equates discipline with aversive practices, a different black rationale for the use of corporal punishment, and the importance of the phenomena of bien educado for newly migrated Mexican parents. All of the study data on black parenting is now available and is written in a form that is designed especially for parent trainers (Alvy,

Harrison, Rosen and Fuentes, 1982). The discussion of this data, as well as the viewpoints of the black parenting scholars, touched off both heated and enlightening discussions. It forced the trainees to look at their own cultural and class biases, and to better appreciate differences.

The curriculum on child abuse and neglect was based on publications from the California Departments of Justice and Public Social Services, the National Center on Child Abuse, and on a CICC monograph, Child Abuses: A Summary of What is Known (Alvy, 1977). Basic information about child abuse and about the role of parent training in community strategies to treat and prevent child abuse was conveyed and discussed. The practical matter of reporting suspected abuses and relating to abusive parents in parent training programs were topics of special concern.

In arriving at guidelines on how parent trainers might relate to the child development information needs of parents, it was decided that their role should be that of a resource person regarding child development. Very few of the trainees had had a great deal of prior education in child development and those who did had received their education many years ago. Given that only a session or two in this course could be devoted to child development and that it was unlikely that these busy professionals would have the time to take a refresher course, the role of resource person (not expert) seemed like the most practical one to emphasize.

In terms of the types of child development information that parents were likely to need or request, we looked to the results of the 15 Child Development Information Research Studies that had been conducted under the auspices of the federal Administration for Children, Youth and Families (Sparling and Lewis, 1980) and to the results of the follow up interviews with the pilot phase graduates. As may be recalled, those interviews contained a series of questions which asked the trainers to indicate what parents had actually requested or needed in the way of child development information. The questions were organized into six information categories: physical health and sickness, practical day-to-day activities, general child development, social relations in the home and

community, children with special problems, and community resources (see interview form in the Appendix).

Another activity that was part of the preparation for this section of the course was to select a child development book that the trainers could employ as a basic resource volume. After reviewing dozens of books, a Child's Body: A Parent's Manual (Diagram Group, 1977) was chosen. This book is written from the perspective of what parents need to know, it is profusely illustrated, and it is very easy to read.

This part of the course was conducted through discussions of their roles as resource persons and through the use of exercises where the trainees used the Child's Body to find answers to typical questions that parents ask. The use of other informational sources, as well as the use of colleagues and other professionals, was also discussed. In terms of community resources, the trainees were oriented to either obtaining information on such relevant resources as child care and baby sitting on their own or to having a knowledgeable community person make presentations in their groups.

The course was evaluated by having the trainees complete session-by-session evaluation questionnaires and by having them answer essay questions on the basic issues (see Appendix).

8. Program Staffing

The program was staffed by a half-time Program Director who had a doctorate in clinical child psychology, a half-time Research Associate with a doctorate in psychology, a quarter time Research Assistant, and a full time Administrative Assistant. The staff was supplemented by parent training experts who were contracted with to deliver the conference presentations and to lead the intensive workshops, and by graduate students who were contracted with to be interviewers for the workshop follow up interviews.

For the most part, the parent training experts were doctoral level psychologists. An attempt was made to have the same expert

who delivered the conference presentation on a particular approach serve as the leader of the intensive workshop in that approach. This happened for all cycles in regard to the STEP-Adlerian approach, and for most cycles in regard to the behavioral approach. For P.E.T., Dr. Gordon delivered the conference presentations and one of the National Trainers from his Effectiveness Training organization led the intensive P.E.T. workshops. Consultant fees were paid directly to all presenters and leaders except in regard to the P.E.T. workshops. A contract was negotiated between CICC and the Effectiveness Training organization and that organization paid the P.E.T. workshop leader. The contract covered all of the Effectiveness Training's costs, including the costs for the workshop materials.

The Program Director's role was very extensive since he also served as the leader and creator of the Implementation Seminar and the Parent Development course. The director selected the staff and the parent training experts. In regard to the experts, their knowledge of and reputation in the particular approaches were important selection factors, as was their previous experience in training parenting instructors. Also of prime importance was their personal style and ability to generate enthusiasm for their approaches. They had to be committed, competent professionals who could inspire and convert other professionals.

The Research Associate was primarily responsible for the design and execution of all evaluation and research activities. This included instrument development, data collection, summary and analysis, and training and supervising the interviewers. The Research Assistant worked directly under the Associate.

The Administrative Assistant, the only full time staff member, was responsible for coordinating all communications about the program, carrying out all clerical functions, and making logistical and material arrangements for the conferences, workshops and seminars.

The Program Advisory Council was most helpful in the pilot phases as it served to legitimize the program in the eyes of some

professionals and agencies. It was composed of highly respected persons from the core mental health disciplines and their connection with the program made it more acceptable. After the program had been in operation for a few years, the program graduates carried out this legitimacy-acceptance function. They became the program's goodwill ambassadors.

The members of the Advisory Council were also very helpful in alerting the program how best to relate to each discipline, and most of this advice and consultation took place on an individual basis as it was very difficult to arrange meetings.

The staffing pattern, the contractual arrangements and the advisory council assistance all worked very well, and program replicators might want to follow these precedents. Having a very knowledgeable professional direct the program seems essential, and it seems wise to have that person also lead the Implementation Seminar since agency administrators are involved. The leader of the Parent Development course could be another expert with which the program contracts. Thus, the program could operate with a part time director, parent training experts who are contracted with for the conference, workshops and Parent Development course, a part time program evaluator and follow-up interviewers, and an administrative coordinator/assistant.

CHAPTER THREE: PROGRAM EVALUATION

As has been indicated, each training event in the pilot and expanded phase training cycles was carefully evaluated using a variety of evaluation instruments and methods. The results of these evaluations will now be presented, and each event will be discussed in terms of its contribution to the entire training program.

1. Pilot Phase

Pilot Phase Conferences, 1977 and 1978 The evaluation of these conferences yield information on the participants' professional

backgrounds and previous experiences with parent training, their reactions to the conferences, and their subsequent involvement in the intensive workshops. Enrollment fees were charged for these conferences (\$25 in 1977, \$30 in 1978).

A multifaceted approach was used to recruit participants. Conference brochures were mailed to all mental health agencies in Los Angeles County and several brochures went to each agency (to agency administrators and service staff). The brochures were also mailed to members of professional associations for psychologists, clinical social workers and child psychiatrists. Announcements about the conference were placed in professional newsletters and in local newspapers. Radio public service announcements were also prepared and broadcast.

The 1977 conference attracted 78 persons from 46 different agencies, and the 1978 conference attracted 76 persons from 45 different agencies. A total of 148 of these individuals completed the conference questionnaire and most of them were available for the three month follow-up.

Table 6 contains a summary of participant characteristics. The vast majority were women, and they were a heterogeneous group in terms of agencies and professions represented. The majority came from mental health agencies, though there were many participants from social service agencies like foster care, child protective services, adoptions, as well as from educational settings like schools for handicapped children and adult education programs. A wide range of professions were represented with social work being in the majority. Psychiatry was not represented at these conferences.

At the close of the conferences, the participants were asked to rate the entire conference, the presentations and the panel discussion with respect to usefulness to their work. For both conferences, the percentage of participants whose ratings were either 4 or 5 (on a 5-point scale) was: Entire conference = 72% (n = 127), PET presentation = 71% (n = 132), Adlerian presentation = 62% (n = 130), behavioral presentation = 53% (n = 133) and the panel discussion = 47% (n = 122). Thus, the majority of the participants found the entire conference to be of high use for their agency work.

TABLE 6
1977 and 1978 Conference and Workshop Participants:
Gender, Agency Classification, and Professions

	1977 and 1978 Conference Participants		1977 Workshop Participants		1978 Workshop Participants	
	n = 148	%	n = 44	%	n = 45	%
Gender						
Female	116	78	36	82	37	82
Male	32	22	8	18	8	18
Agencies						
Mental Health	88	60	19	43	25	56
Social Service	21	14	10	23	11	24
Education	30	20	14	32	7	16
Other	9	6	1	2	2	5
Professions						
Psychiatry	0	0	1	2	0	0
Psychology	19	13	7	16	10	22
Social Work	52	35	21	48	24	53
Education	15	10	7	16	2	5
Counseling	20	13	2	5	5	11
Nursing	13	9	2	5	2	5
Other	29	20	4	9	2	5

Smaller majorities found the presentations themselves to be highly useful and slightly less than half found the panel to be of high use.

Answers to open-ended questions helped to explain why participants found the conference useful. First, there were frequent favorable statements about the structure, content, and processes of the conference in terms of affording a unique opportunity for contrasting and comparing different methods of training parents. Second, there were frequent statements that the conference opened up another option for the participants to consider in helping parents with child rearing problems. The conference seemed to yield an increased awareness that the training approaches could be viable additions to traditional psychotherapeutic, counseling, and social service interventions.

These statements were of particular interest when viewed within the context of what the participants revealed about their previous experiences with parent training. The majority of the participants

represented themselves as delivering parent training services prior to attending the conference. Of 141 respondents at the two conferences, 99 indicated that they were currently delivering parent training services. When asked to describe the services, only 16 indicated that they were delivering a theoretically-based parent training service and the remaining 83 were vague in describing the services that they considered to be parent training. In addition, only 21 of the 99 persons who said they were delivering parent training services reported that they themselves had received any formal training to qualify them to deliver a parent training service.

We interpreted this information as follows. First, the fact that so many indicated that they were already delivering a parent training service probably reflected the high need of parents who use public services for direct assistance in child rearing. Second, the fact that so many of the participants were vague in describing their parent training services probably reflected that they were delivering parent guidance. Arnold (1978) described it as "the offering to parents of information, clarification, advice, support, counsel, directives, supportive psychotherapy or other interactions with a professional helper, with the intention of indirectly helping the child." Third, the fact that so few had received any formal training to deliver what they represented as parent training services raised questions about professional propriety and standards. Does the usual training of human service professionals qualify someone to deliver a parent training service? What are the standards that agencies use in determining who can offer such services? The participants' concern about their preparation probably contributed to their attending the conference.

Of the total number of persons who attended the two conferences, approximately twenty seven percent enrolled in the intensive workshops. Since it would be instructive to know what contributed to their choice, a multiple regression analysis was performed to see if any characteristics of the conference participants could predict workshop enrollment. The characteristics not only included such

variables as profession, education, marital status and parental status, but also such variables as their ratings of the conference, their attitudes toward parent training, whether they read or purchased reading materials at the conference, and whether they had taken a parent training class themselves. The multiple regression analysis yielded only one significant result, a multiple R of .31 for reading material purchased at the conference.

This result indicates that those who purchased reading materials at the conference and who reported having used or read the materials at the three month follow-up were more likely to enroll in the workshops. This can be interpreted to mean that those who were stimulated enough to buy relevant reading materials, and who may have kept their motivation going by reading the materials, were more likely to go to the expense and life rearrangements that were required of workshop enrollment. Another way of looking at this result is that none of the educational, professional, agency, family or personal characteristics of the conference participants could predict enrollment in the workshops.

Pilot Phase Workshops, 1977 and 1978 The evaluation of these workshops yielded information on the backgrounds of the participants, how they learned about the workshops, the extent to which they developed the attitudes and skills that are necessary to conduct parent training services, the types of service uses which they made of their workshop experiences, and the types of support which their agencies provided for delivering parent training services. Enrollment fees were charged, ranging from \$75 to \$125 per workshop.

An attempt was made to recruit 15 participants per workshop (45 per cycle) and it was hoped that the majority could be recruited from the professionals who attended the conferences. The 1977 workshops attracted 44 persons and the 1978 workshops attracted 45. Of these 89 workshop participants, 42 had attended a conference. The remainder had to be recruited through extensive and time-consuming efforts, including mailing workshop announcements to agencies and professional groups and calling administrators and

service heads at agencies that were not represented at the conference.

Table 6 indicates the gender, professions and agencies of the workshop participants. Eighty two percent were women. The majority came from core mental health professions, with the exception of 16% educators in the 1977 workshops: this was a result of having to recruit personnel from a school district's program for developmentally disabled children to fill the behavioral workshop of that cycle. For both cycles, a total of 60 agencies were represented and the majority were mental health agencies.

The positions and job responsibilities of the workshop participants varied. A few were agency or department heads. The majority were line staff with direct service responsibilities. Depending upon their agencies and professions, they were responsible for delivering psychotherapy, counseling, testing, social and educational services with a wide range of client populations. Many of these workshop participants were employed by more than one agency and some also had private practices.

Only in two instances were there more than two staff persons from the same agency in the same workshop. As has been indicated, the 1977 behavioral workshop had 6 teachers from a school district's program for disabled children. The 1977 STEP-Adlerian workshop had 5 staff members from the L.A. County Department of Adoptions (the Director of Training of that department subsequently enrolled in the 1978 STEP-Adlerian workshop).

It is clear from these results that these workshops would not have been filled without the personnel from the educational and social service agencies and without the extensive post-conference recruitment efforts. These results were, of course, major reasons for altering the training contract for the expanded phase cycles.

In terms of whether the workshops were successful in developing the attitudes and skills that would allow the participants to deliver parenting services, the trainer's evaluations and observations were the primary data sources.

The workshop trainers were asked to use their observations and interactions with the participants and each participants'

performance on the workshop content exams to arrive at a global evaluation of each participant. They were to use these informational sources to assess each participant as being excellent, good or in need of additional training. About 80% of all of the workshop participants were assessed as being either excellent or good in terms of their having developed the necessary knowledge and skills to qualify them to deliver parent training services. A minority in each workshop was judged as needing additional work.

While it is possible that the trainers' evaluations were positively slanted since they had the major responsibility for insuring that the participants developed the necessary knowledge and skills, we believe that their assessments were as free from bias as possible. Each trainer had been carefully chosen and informed about the purposes of the entire program. They were people of strong integrity who could manage less than 100% success. Indeed, less than 100% was expected since there was no prescreening of workshop participants.

In terms of how the participants actually used what they had learned in the workshops, it was necessary to speculate on the variety of uses that one could possibly make. These could include (1) training parents in groups, (2) training parents on an individual basis, (3) training parents as part of other services such as family therapy, (4) using the workshop skills in relating directly to or treating clients, (5) training other persons to use the skills, and (6) delivering presentations about parent training. Questions regarding these types of use, as well as the number of persons who had been impacted through each type, were asked during the follow-up telephone interviews with each program participant.

There were two sets of follow-up interviews which took place at varying times after the completion of the workshops (see Table 7). The second longitudinal refollow up interviews were designed to see if there were changes in how the graduates used the workshop experiences over an extended period of time.

Both sets of interviews also inquired about a wide range of additional issues. They inquired about the types of support that

their agencies had provided, such as paying workshop enrollment fees, providing release time, purchasing parent training materials, etc. The participants were also asked to rate the importance of parent training, psychotherapy, counseling and family therapy skills in relation to their work, and to indicate the types of problems and issues that they had encountered in delivering parent training services. At the refollow up interviews they were also asked about the child development informational needs of parents and about the characteristics of parents who seemed to benefit the most and the least from parent training.

Table 7

Number of 1977 and 1978 Training Cycle Graduates
Who Were Interviewed at Follow Up and Refollow Up

Training Cycle and Workshops	Follow Up		N	Refollow Up	
	N	Months		Mean Months	Range of Months
<u>1977</u>					
P.E.T.	14	6	12	21.0	20-21
STEP	13	6	10	20.6	20-21
Behavioral	12	6	8	22.5	20-24
<u>1978</u>					
P.E.T.	13	3	10	16.4	12-18
STEP	15	3	14	16.6	15-17
Behavioral	15	3	11	18.0	18
Totals	82		65		

Follow Up Interviews The results of these interviews in regard to the six types of training uses are presented in Table 8. In assessing the meaning of these results it is important to keep in mind several important factors.

TABLE 8

1977 and 1978 Training Workshops: Number of Graduates Engaging in Each Type of Training Utilization and Number of Persons Impacted by Each Type as Reported by Graduates at Follow Up Interviews

A. 1977 Workshops: Six-Month Follow Up									
Type of Utilization	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (SPT)		
	Graduates (n = 14)*	Persons Impacted n	%	Graduates (n = 13)*	Persons Impacted n	%	Graduates (n = 12)*	Persons Impacted n	%
Trained Parents in Groups	6	NA	NA	10	364	15	3	41	4
Trained Parents Individually	11	NA	NA	4	19	1	3	26	3
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	14	NA	NA	12	592	24	11	365	33
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	14	NA	NA	12	497	20	10	318	29
Trained Others to Use Skills	4	NA	NA	8	127	5	5	41	4
Delivered Presentations	13	NA	NA	13	894	35	11	290	27
		1,413**			2,493	100		1,081	100
B. 1978 Workshops: Three-Month Follow Up									
Type of Utilization	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (Confident Parenting)		
	Graduates (n = 13)*	Persons Impacted n	%	Graduates (n = 15)*	Persons Impacted n	%	Graduates (n = 15)*	Persons Impacted n	%
Trained Parents in Groups	7	213	21	8	183	22	10	180	16
Trained Parents Individually	8	60	6	6	87	10	10	44	4
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	6	80	8	9	65	8	12	175	16
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	11	NA	NA	13	NA	NA	13	NA	NA
Trained Others to Use Skills	2	42	4	7	77	9	10	105	9
Delivered Presentations	13	629	61	15	434	51	14	625	55
		1,024	100		846	100		1,129	100

*Number of Graduates available for follow up interviews.

**Graduates' overall estimate.

NA Information not available.

The 1977 Parent Effectiveness Training workshop was the first one completed, and its graduates were the first to be interviewed through the follow-up telephone procedure. It was from those interviews that we developed the six categories of utilization. The graduates of this workshop were asked to estimate the number of persons impacted from all types of usage, not by specific types. This is indicated by the NA entries in Table 8.

The follow up interviews for the 1978 workshops were conducted only three months later, due to grant-reporting requirements. During these interviews, we did not ask for the number of clients with whom the graduates had used the workshop skills directly, thus eliminating a very high category of usage. These two features meant that the the 1978 graduates had less time to use their workshop experiences and less opportunity to indicate the extent of their usage.

The total persons impacted from the workshops is probably a high estimate. The demand characteristics of the follow up interview probably stimulated the graduates to give as high an estimate as possible. In addition, the same person could be counted in more than one category. For example, one of the parents whom a graduate trained in a group could be the same person who had been seen in another service.

Keeping these qualifications in mind, the total number of persons reported as being impacted per training cycle would be impressive even if divided in half. As many as 4,987 persons were estimated as having been impacted by the 1977 workshop graduates through the six types of utilization. In half the amount of time and with one less category of utilization, the 1978 graduates estimated 2,999 persons.

Variability of Workshop Utilization. There was considerable variability across the workshops in terms of the total persons estimated as impacted and the number of graduates engaging in different types of use.

For the 1977 cycle, the Adlerian workshop resulted in markedly higher overall estimates as well as the highest number of graduates who trained parents in groups. This workshop was composed of several adoption workers who constituted groups from their caseloads, a counseling agency director who had several previously constituted parent groups with which to work, a psychiatric social worker from a county mental health clinic that became very receptive to running parent training groups, and a paraprofessional counselor from a community mental health agency that strongly promoted preventative interventions like parent training. Some of these persons had earlier relationships with the workshop trainer and were very eager to be in this workshop. The 1977 PET workshop produced the next highest overall estimates, but less than half of these graduates actually trained parents in groups. This may have been due to the fee for each parent trained that the Effectiveness Training organization stipulated must be paid when a standard PET course was conducted. The 1977 Social Learning Workshop (Systematic Parent Training) resulted in the lowest estimates and fewest graduates training parents in groups. These results were probably a joint function of the persons who constituted this workshop and the fact that group parent training is not stressed in this version of the approach.

For the 1978 cycle, a different version of the Social Learning Approach (Confident Parenting) produced both the highest overall estimates and the largest number of graduates who trained parents in groups. This version was chosen partially because of the relatively poor results from the 1977 version and mainly because it emphasized group parent training. The Confident Parenting version appeared to be the easiest approach to learn, as indicated by many of the workshop graduates stating that not all the workshop sessions were necessary. Other evidence of the efficiency of this version was the fact that two-thirds of the Confident Parenting graduates engaged in every type of utilization. Thus, this version may have been the easiest to teach and the easiest to apply.

There was also considerable within-workshop variability in terms of number of persons estimated as impacted by each workshop graduate. For the 1977 cycle, the range of persons estimated by the PET workshop graduates was 5-5000; for the Adlerian graduates, 49-352; and for the Social Learning workshop graduates, 23-425. For the 1978 cycle, the range for the PET graduates was 2-192; for the Adlerian graduates, 8-122; and the Social Learning graduates, 13-160. This variability indicates that some of the graduates made very little use of the workshop experiences while others were tremendously productive.

The follow up interviews also revealed that many participants made creative and varied uses of the training, as well as encountering specific problems and deriving personal benefits.

In regard to training parents in groups, three subcategories of use were noted. Many of the participants used their training to conduct structured parent training courses in their agencies. Others used it to conduct structured parent training courses at churches or within their private practices. Yet others incorporated segments of the structured courses, such as active listening, encouragement, or praising, into other parenting groups that they were leading.

Many participants reported difficulties in getting their agencies to support structured parent training courses. Advertising, recruiting, and scheduling for an eight-to-ten-week course within agencies which normally do not deliver this type of service is always difficult and requires a tremendous amount of effort and dedication. Many persons were ready to do this but were often frustrated by their agencies. Part of the frustration stemmed from the agencies lack of willingness or ability to pay for the costs of the courses. This was particularly true for the PET courses because of the \$20 per-parent-trained-fee that had to be paid to the Effectiveness Training organization. Enthusiastic efforts to start courses often came to an abrupt halt when an administrator said there was no money for educational supplies. Some were able

to negotiate beyond this point and were successful in getting their agencies to find the necessary monies. Others were stumped and put their efforts into starting structured courses in other settings.

Training parents on an individual basis ranged from conducting the entire structured course for one parent or couple to using a segment from a course to train one parent or couple. This usage was often hard to distinguish from "training parents as part of other services" because very few agencies were in the habit of assigning parents to therapists, counselors, or workers solely for parent training.

In regard to training parents as part of other services, there were as many uses as there were other services that the participants offered. Most offered individual psychotherapy or counseling services, assessment services, or social services. Almost all of the parents seen for these services were experiencing troubled relations with their children. Previous to their workshop trainings, they would understand the parents' problems mainly in terms of psychodynamics. But now they could also understand the troubled relations in terms of ineffective child-rearing methods and they would deal directly with the child-rearing problems by training the parents in one or more of the skills learned in the workshops. This happened with many who conducted group and family therapy, and even with some who were involved in residential or day treatment programs.

Nearly all of the participants reported having used the workshop skills in relating directly to clients. A few had integrated the skills so thoroughly that they used them as their basic strategy for communicating and relating to a variety of clients. Others used the skills in relating directly to child clients only. When asked why they used the skills in these ways, the most frequent response was that they worked. The skills which were most often used in these ways were the communication and problem-solving skills from PET and STEP, and the praising and mild social punishment skills from the Social Learning workshops.

The participants who trained others to use the skills did it in several ways. Some trained groups of other staff members in the

same multi-session manner that they had experienced in the workshops. Others trained staff members to use particular skills in relating directly to clients, especially to children. One particularly creative use was when a participant trained the staffs of several board and care homes for psychiatric patients how to use problem-solving and democratic decision-making procedures to conduct patient government meetings.

The presentations varied tremendously in terms of formality and the audiences. Most delivered presentations at staff meetings at their agencies. Some made presentations to other professional audiences at professional conventions and regional workshops. Others delivered presentations before community groups, such as P.T.A.s and churches, and still others made presentations in writing as part of newsletters, articles, or grant proposals. Nearly all delivered informal presentations to friends, relatives, spouses, and children. They seemed to become persons to whom others would informally turn for child-rearing help. One participant reported that her presentation and use of the skills was so convincing to her husband that he began using the skills with their children as well as with his co-workers on the job.

The follow up interviews also revealed that (1) parents asked for child development information which the graduates did not feel prepared to convey, (2) maintaining attendance during the multi-session classes was difficult, and (3) training black and Hispanic parents raised questions about the relevance of the approaches, although some minority parents spoke highly of the approaches.

Prediction of Utilization. Stepwise multiple regression analysis were performed to see if it were possible to predict the number of parent training groups started and the estimates of total persons impacted by the 82 graduates of both workshop cycles. Nineteen predictor variables were chosen on the basis that data on these were collected on at least four of the six workshops. The variables included conference attendance, demographic characteristics of graduates, attitudes of graduates toward various types of

human service interventions, workshop performance, and agency support.

In regard to the number of parent training groups started by workshop graduates (Mean number of groups started per graduate = 1.2, SD = 1.6, N = 67), three variables accounted for 44% of the variance and were the best predictors of groups started. The remaining 16 variables accounted for 29% of the variance with no single variable accounting for more than 5%.

The best predictor of number of groups started was the ratings of the participants' workshop performance by the workshop trainer. Trainer evaluations were positively correlated with number of groups started ($r = .44$, $p < .05$). This may indicate that the best qualified graduates were the most likely to run parent training groups. The second best predictor had to do with the graduates' attitudes about parent training skills in relation to their agency work. At the time of the follow up interview, they were asked to rate whether being trained to deliver a parent training service should be a requirement of their job. Ratings were positively correlated with number of groups started ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). The third best predictor had to do with agency support. Agency compensation of the graduates in ways other than paying the workshop enrollment fee was positively correlated with number of groups started ($r = .40$, $p < .01$).

In regard to the total persons estimated as impacted through all types of utilization (Mean estimated persons impacted per graduate = 102.2, SD = 85.1, n = 82), three variables accounted for 19% of the total variance. The remaining 16 variables accounted for 29% of the total variance with no single variable accounting for more than 3%.

The best predictor was the graduates' rating, at the time of the follow up interview, of the importance of parent training skills for their current work. Ratings were positively correlated ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) with total persons estimated as impacted. This may indicate that the graduates who made the broadest use of their workshop experiences found them to be most useful. The second and third best predictors had to do with agency support. The agency paying the workshop enrollment fee was negatively correlated ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$).

In the agencies that did not pay the enrollment fee, the graduates may have become extremely active in trying to elicit involvement. The third best predictor was less ambiguous to interpret. The agencies adding the parent training program, that the graduates were trained to deliver, to their ongoing services was positively correlated with total persons estimated as impacted ($r = .23$, $p < .05$). Adding the program to ongoing services was a strong indication of support. It is instructive to note that these two agency support variables were not themselves correlated ($r = .08$), indicating that they provided separate predictive power. Finally, it is important to stress that although these estimates of persons impacted may have been overstated, the predictive relationships would be the same if all graduates had overestimated impact by similar amounts.

Refollow Up Longitudinal Interviews These interviews yielded a wealth of data on the changes in types of utilization that the graduates made as more time elapsed since the end of the workshops, and on the numbers of persons who they impacted through the various types.

Table 9 contains a comparison between the percentage of graduates who engaged in each type of utilization at the follow up and refollow up interviews. Three changes are evident. First, a higher percentage of graduates were conducting parent training groups by the time of the refollow up. About half had run groups at the follow up and two thirds had done so by the refollow up. This increase probably indicates that it just took more time for some graduates to generate a group. This result also shows that fully one third of the graduates had not run a group at all. The second noteworthy change was the decrease in the percentage of graduates who reported training parents on an individual basis. About half of the graduates had reported this usage at the time of the follow up and only a quarter did so at the time of the refollow up. This may reflect that as more graduates were able to generate groups there was less a need to train parents on an individual basis.

Table 3
Percentage of Graduates Making Different Types of
Utilization at the Follow Up and Refollow Up

<u>Type of Utilization</u>	1977 Cycle				1978 Cycle			
	PET	STEP	SPT	Total	PET	STEP	CP	Total
	N=14	N=13	N=12	N=39	N=13	N=15	N=15	N=43
Trained Parents								
In Groups	43	77	25	49	54	53	67	58
Trained Parents								
Individually	78	31	25	46	62	40	67	56
Trained Parents as								
Part of Other Services	100	92	92	95	46	60	80	63
Used Skills in Relating								
Directly to Clients	100	92	83	92	85	87	87	86
Trained Others to								
Use Skills	29	62	42	44	15	47	67	44
Delivered Presentations	93	100	92	95	100	100	93	98

<u>Type of Utilization</u>	1977 Cycle				1978 Cycle			
	PET	STEP	SPT	Total	PET	STEP	CP	Total
	N=12	N=10	N=8	N=30	N=10	N=14	N=11	N=35
Trained Parents								
In Groups	66	90	38	67	60	71	64	66
Trained Parents								
Individually	33	10	38	27	10	7	36	17
Trained Parents as								
Part of Other Services	100	100	88	97	70	71	100	80
Used Skills in Relating								
Directly to Clients	100	100	100	100	90	86	100	91
Trained Others to								
Use Skills	58	80	63	67	60	86	91	80
Delivered Presentations	100	100	100	100	100	93	100	97

The third noteworthy change was that a high percentage of graduates were training other persons to use the skills at the time of the refollow up. Whereas 44 percent were doing this at the follow up, more than 70 percent were doing so at the refollow up. This may reflect that as more graduates felt comfortable with delivering the services they had been trained in they also became confident enough to train other people to deliver them. Three individuals were particularly accomplished in this regard. A psychiatric social worker from a county mental health clinic put on two workshops to train other mental health professionals in her region to conduct STEP groups and she patterned her workshops after the program's workshop. Another STEP graduate, a paraprofessional counselor who worked for a mental health agency that was staffed primarily by paraprofessionals, also conducted a STEP group leader workshop. Several persons who she trained in her workshop were members of the Junior League. These women were so impressed that they got the League to sponsor a series of STEP parent groups and to take on parent training as a Junior League project. A third graduate, who was from the L.A. County Department of Adoptions which is the largest public adoption agency in the United States, stimulated other adoption workers to utilize the criteria of responsible parenthood that she had been exposed to in her training as part of their assessment criteria in studying and screening prospective adoptive parents.

Table 10 contains the graduates' estimates at the time of the refollow up of the numbers of persons who they had impacted through each type of utilization. Unfortunately, these results are not directly comparable to their estimates at the time of the initial follow up (see Table 8) because fewer graduates were available at the refollow up interviews.

To make these data comparable, a prorating procedure was designed which estimated the total persons impacted as if the missing graduates were refollowed. The procedure entailed three steps. Step one was to recalculate the total follow up impact for only those graduates who were refollowed. The second step was to create a

Table 10

1977 and 1978 Training Workshops: Number of Graduates Engaging in Each Type of Training Utilization and Number of Persons Impacted by Each Type as Reported by Graduates at Refollow Up Interviews

A. 1977 Workshops: Refollow Up									
Type of Utilization	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (SPT)		
	Graduates (N=12)*	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=10)*	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=8)*	Persons Impacted N	%
Trained Parents in Groups	8	295	1%	9	302	6%	3	56	4%
Trained Parents Individually	4	393	1%	1	8	0%	3	122	8%
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	12	3621	14%	10	1038	21%	7	151	10%
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	12	20,076	75%	10	2200	44%	8	700	46%
Trained Others to Use Skills	7	933	4%	8	353	7%	5	181	12%
Delivered Presentations	12	1330	5%	10	1141	23%	8	324	21%
		26,648	100%		5042	100%		1534	100%

B. 1978 Workshops: Refollow Up									
Type of Utilization	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (Confident Parenting)		
	Graduates (N=10)*	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=14)*	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=11)*	Persons Impacted N	%
Trained Parents in Groups	6	307	6%	10	192	6%	7	260	2%
Trained Parents Individually	1	12	0%	1	4	0%	4	33	0%
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	7	985	18%	10	508	17%	11	1893	23%
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	9	2857	52%	12	1422	48%	11	4040	48%
Trained Others to Use Skills	6	289	6%	12	189	7%	10	1148	14%
Delivered Presentations	10	1004	18%	13	634	21%	11	1513	12%
		5454	100%		2949	100%		8887	100%

* Number of Graduates available for refollow up interviews.

"prorating percentage" or PP for each group as follows: $PP = 1.0$ minus the total impact of refollowed graduates at the time of the initial follow up divided by the total impact of refollowed graduates at the time of the refollow up interview. Step three was to calculate the "prorated impact" or PI at refollow up by adding the total impact at refollow up (the figure that emerged out of Step 1) to the PP figure multiplied by the PP.

For example, in the 1977 PET workshop only 12 of the 14 graduates were interviewed at the refollow up, and the total impact of these 12 at the refollow up was 26,648 (see Table 10). From Table 8, it can be seen that the original 14 graduates had a total impact of 1413 persons. When the totals for the two graduates who were not available at the follow up are removed, the total is only 1308. Thus, $PP = 1.0$ minus 1308 divided by 1413 = 7.4%. The prorated total refollow up impact becomes: $PI = 26,648$ plus 7.4% multiplied by 26,648 = 28,628.

Table 11 presents the total impact data for the follow up and the prorated total impact data for the refollow up. Several points are noteworthy. First, the total persons impacted increased dramatically from follow up to refollow up. At the follow up the graduates impacted nearly 9000 persons through the six types of utilization. In contrast, between 12 and 18 months later the prorated total was over 43,000 persons impacted. (One graduate reported excessively large, 11,550, usage in terms of using the workshop skills with clients in a series of large group meetings. All figures in Table 11 reflect total usage including both this graduate's estimates and reducing the estimate to the median usage, 150. If this graduate's estimate is included rather than using the median, the total impact rises from 43,000 persons to 58,000.) As was mentioned previously, these estimates are probably high but even if they were twice as high as the actual usage they would be impressive. Clearly, as a group these graduates had used their training program experiences to impact thousands of persons in a variety of human relationship-enhancing ways.

Table 11

Total Persons Impacted by 1977 and 1978 Workshop
Graduates at Follow Up and Refollow Up
(Refollow Up Data was Prorated)

		Follow Up					Refollow Up		
	Number Graduates	Total Impact	Impact Per Mo.	Impact Per Mo. Per Graduate	Number Graduates	Prorated Percent	Prorated Tot. Imp.	Impact Per Mo.	Impact Per Mo. Per Graduate ^a
<u>1977 Workshops</u>									
PET	14	1413	236	17	12	7.4	28,628 (16,735) ^c	1363 (797) ^c	97 (57)
STEP	13	2493	416	32	10	40.6	7,087	344	26
SPT	12	1081	180	15	8	39.4	2,139	95	8
Totals		4987	832	X=21			37,854 (22,961) ^c	1802 (1236) ^c	X=44 (X=30)
<u>1978 Workshops</u>									
PET	13	1344 ^b	448	34	10	17.7	6,420	391	30
Step	15	1206 ^b	402	27	14	6.6	3,145	189	13
CP	15	1459 ^b	486	32	11	22.1	10,848	603	40
Totals		4009	1336	X=25			20,413	1,183	X=28

a = Based on total graduates at refollow up.

b = Includes estimated use in relating to clients (see Table 8).

c = One graduate who had excessively high usage in relating to clients (11,550) was replaced by median, 150.

Table 11 also includes an estimate of the impact per month per graduate. At the follow up, the graduates were impacting an average of 23 persons a month and at the refollow up this increased to 29 persons per month. This overall increase was due to a dramatic 235% increase in utilization by the 1977 PET workshop (from 17 persons per month to 57 per month), as well as a smaller 25% increase by the 1978 Confident Parenting workshop (from an average of 32 to 40 persons impacted per month). All other workshops decreased their per month utilization rate anywhere from 12% to 52%. Thus, while the impact across all workshops increased dramatically, the overall increase masked some major differences among workshops.

The 1977 PET workshop graduates increased their monthly average of persons impacted dramatically from the time of the follow up to the refollow up, but the 1978 PET graduates decreased their average impact. The 1977 and 1978 STEP graduates decreased their average impact over time with the 1978 showing a steeper reduction. The 1977 behavioral workshop graduates (Systematic Parent Training) decreased their average impact but the 1978 graduates (Confident Parenting) increased theirs. Thus, there were different patterns for different workshops, making this result very hard to interpret.

The major use which the graduates made of their workshop training was to use the workshop skills in relating directly to clients (ranging from 44% of the total persons impacted through this use to as high as 75% with a median of 52%). This not only reflects the high utility of the human relationship skills which are taught but also that this is probably the easiest use to make of them. It only requires that the graduate use the skills in his or her normal service duties and not through creating additional services.

This use is not, of course, the use that the workshops had focused upon. Table 12 contains the data on the primary focus of

the workshops, to have the graduates conduct parent training groups. It shows that 44 graduates had run 84 groups containing a total of 981 parents at the time of the follow up. By the refollow up, the 43 graduates who were interviewed and who ran groups had run 111 groups with a total of 1412 parents. When the previously described prorating procedure is applied, these figures changed to an estimated 142 groups with 1637 parents.

When this result is considered along with the earlier reported result that a higher percentage of graduates had conducted groups by the time of the refollow up, a clearer picture about running parent training groups emerges. It seems that despite the higher percentage of graduates running groups at the time of the refollow up, the number of groups that were run between the follow up and refollow up testings were fewer than those run between the end of the workshops and the follow up. This decrease is probably a joint function of the marginal agency support that the graduates received, the difficulties inherent in generating groups, and the absence or lessening of pressure from CICC to conduct groups.

In summary, it seems that one to two years after their training the graduates continued to impact thousands of people through a variety of uses of their training. But they were not running parent-ing groups at the same rate as they had shortly after completing their training.

Table 12
Number of Parenting Groups and Participating Parents
Reported by Graduates at Follow Up and Refollow Up

		<u>Follow Up</u>				<u>Refollow Up</u>		
	Number Graduates Interviewed	Number Leading Groups	Number of Groups	Number of Parents	Number Graduates Interviewed	Number Leading Groups	Number of Groups	Number of Parents
<u>1977 Workshops</u>								
PET	14	6	^a	^a	12	8	20	295
STEP	13	10	30	364	10	9	27	302
SPT	13	3	4	41	8	3	8	56
Totals	39	19	34	405	30	20	55	653
<u>1978 Workshops</u>								
PET	13	7	17	213	10	6	18	307
STEP	15	8	13	183	14	10	22	192
CP	15	10	20	180	11	7	26	260
Totals	43	25	50	576	35	23	66	759

a = Data not collected.

Prediction of Utilization. A series of regression equations were developed to see if it was possible to predict, on the basis of a variety of refollow up and follow up data, the total number of persons who the graduates estimated as impacting and the number of parenting groups that they conducted. A wide range of variables were used as potential predictors including trainer ratings of graduate workshop performance, follow up attitudes and agency support, and refollow up attitudes, agency support and self-assessed marketing needs. The analyses were run on 55 graduates for whom all of these data were available.

In regard to total persons estimated as impacted ($\bar{X} = 807.5$, $s = 1754$), the predictive equation included 17 variables which accounted for 63 percent of the variance. Seven of these variables dealt with agency support, five with graduate attitudes, four with marketing needs and one with conference attendance. Only one predictor variable which accounted for 8 percent of the variance correlated with total estimated impact, and that was whether the agency had added another type of parent training program to its services at the time of the refollow up ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). This may reflect that when an agency becomes so supportive of parent training that it offers more than one type it creates a situation where its parent training staff person is allowed to spend a great deal of energy in promoting parent training and therefore impact a great many people.

In regard to parenting groups conducted ($\bar{X} = 1.83$, $s = 2.06$), the predictive equation included 11 variables which accounted for 68 percent of the variance. Five of these variables dealt with agency support, four with graduate attitudes, one with marketing needs and one with the trainer's rating of workshop performance. Trainer's rating of workshop performance was the best predictor ($r = .45$, $p < .001$) and accounted for 20 percent of the variance. The next best predictor was an agency support variable, provision of compensation to graduate at time of follow up ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), and it accounted for 12.5 percent of the variance. Together these

two variables accounted for nearly half of the predicted variance. It is instructive to note that these variables were also the main predictors of groups conducted at the time of the follow up. This can be seen as further evidence that the most competent graduates (based on workshop trainer evaluations) ran the most groups and that they were able to capitalize on the initial support which their agencies provided.

Agency Support. Table 13 contains data on the specific kinds of agency support which the graduates reported as receiving, and the graduates' appreciation of the attitudes of their agencies toward parent training. As is evident, the agencies did not overwhelmingly support the graduates in starting and running parent training groups. Slightly more than half provided administrative support (clerical assistance, mailing brochures, etc.) but less than half provided other types of support. For example, only a quarter of the agencies supplied such important support as child care or transportation for participating parents.

The two training cycles did not differ a great deal in their agency support, except that more agencies in the 1978 cycle provided their staff with other kinds of compensation (release time, mileage, etc.) for attending the workshops. Two thirds of the graduates of the 1978 workshops received such compensation compared to only one sixth of the 1977 graduates.

Regarding the graduates' assessment of the attitudes of their agencies toward parent training, the agencies were seen as placing a fairly high value on parent training but not necessarily planning to provide support for such services in the future. This may reflect that having staff trained to deliver the services increases the value or knowledge of the services but that other practical considerations (lack of reimbursement for parent training services, focus on working with highly disturbed clients, etc.) make it less likely that the agencies would include parent training in their service planning.

Table 13

Percentage of Graduates Receiving Agency
Support and Graduate Assessment of
Agency Attitudes Toward Parent Training

Agency Support and Attitudes	1977 Cycle (N=30) ^a	1978 Cycle (N=35) ^a	Total (N=65)
<u>Support</u>			
Paid Workshop Fee	28%	30%	29%
Provided Other Compensation	17%	67%	42%
Requested Training Program As In-Service	24%	35%	30%
Added Training Program To Agency Services	21%	20%	20%
Purchased Training Materials	38%	44%	41%
Provided Parent Support	25%	23%	24%
Provided Adm. Support	55%	58%	57%
Paid People to Run Groups	41%	40%	41%
<u>Attitudes (Mean Scores)^b</u>			
Value Parent Training As A Community Service	3.48	3.39	3.43
Planning to Provide Future Support for Parent Training	2.62	2.95	2.82

a In some cases graduates did not work for an agency or did not answer a specific question. Thus, N may be lower for some figures.

b The scale was: 1=Not at all, 2=Very Little, 3=Average, 4=Very Much, 5=Extremely.

Needs for Additional Training. Table 14 reflects the graduates' assessments of the sufficiency of their workshop training in preparing them to be an effective parent trainer, and their preferences for additional training if it were made available to them. In general more than half (54%) rated the workshop training as sufficient (categories 4 and 5), only 3% felt that it was insufficient and another 11% less than sufficient (category 2). In terms of felt need for additional training, most graduates expressed an interest in training in child development, cultural differences in child rearing, and marketing. The majority also expressed an interest in a more in-depth exploration of their workshop approach

Table 14

Graduate Assessment of Workshop Training
and Percentage of Graduates Expressing
Interest in Additional Types of Training

	1977 Cycle (N=30)	1978 Cycle (N=35)	Total (N=65)
<u>Sufficiency of Workshop</u>			
5 = Sufficient	20%	18%	19%
4	23%	45%	35%
3	40%	24%	32%
2	13%	9%	11%
1 = Insufficient	3%	3%	3%
Mean Rating	3.43	3.67	3.56
<u>Interest in Additional Types of Training</u>			
Repeat of Workshop Material	27%	12%	19%
More Detailed Examination	50%	50%	50%
Advanced Workshop	67%	65%	66%
Different Approach	73%	70%	72%
Child Development Course	67%	62%	64%
Marketing Course	60%	56%	58%
Cultural Differences Course	73%	68%	70%

(theoretical background, history, etc.) and an advanced workshop in that approach, as well as training in other parenting approaches. Thus, the workshops appeared to stimulate the majority of graduates to want even more and varied training to be parenting instructors. And, of course, it was this type of feedback that led to the expansion of the training model to provide additional educational experiences.

Specific Marketing Needs. The percentage of graduates who indicated the need for specific types of marketing information and training is indicated in Table 15. Overall, the 1977 graduates expressed more of a need for this information than the 1978 graduates.

Further, specific types of information seemed to be needed by most graduates, including how to obtain referrals, how to advertise, how to generate interest in parenting groups, how to maintain attendance, and how to utilize CICC resources.

Table 15
Percentage of Graduates Expressing
Need for Marketing Information

Marketing Need	1977 Cycle (N=30)	1978 Cycle (N=35)	Total (N=65)
Presentations to Staff	41%	47%	44%
Approach Supervisor	38%	18%	27%
Negotiate with Supervisor	38%	29%	33%
Obtain In-House Referrals	41%	41%	41%
Obtain Referrals from Other Agencies	72%	62%	67%
Advertise, Publicize, Promote	83%	59%	70%
Generate Lay Community Interest	79%	65%	71%
Generate Outside Agency Interest	72%	56%	63%
Maintain Attendance	59%	56%	57%
Extend Parent Training Course	52%	44%	48%
Use Resources at CICC	86%	56%	70%

Parents Benefiting from Training. The graduates were asked a series of questions about the parents who they had trained who seemed to benefit the most and the least from parent training.

Benefiting most was defined as the graduate assessing that the parent had learned the parenting skills very well and that the parents had reported success in using the skills with their children. Benefiting least was defined as assessing that the parents had not learned the skills well and that the parents had reported that they were not helpful with their children.

The graduates identified 78 who "benefited least" and 86 who "benefited most." For each of these parents data were collected on the following variables: parental characteristics including gender of parent, age, educational level, whether they were receiving some form of government assistance, income level, and general adjustment level. Data were also collected on the level of reported child behavior problems and the ages and numbers of children in the home, and on marital status, degree of marital conflicts, and the type of training that the parents received. The data for these 164 parents were subjected to a discriminant analysis.

The results of the discriminant analyses are depicted in Tables 16 and 17. Table 16 shows the means for both benefit groups as well as the univariate F score comparing groups and the standardized discriminant coefficient for those discriminators included in the model. Table 17 contains the predicted classification results as well as the test statistics. Only three variables (parental age, educational level and marital conflict) were used to generate a significant discriminant equation (Wilks Lambda = .89, $p < .0003$). This equation was successful nearly 70% of the time in classifying the parents into their correct groups.

Several points are particularly noteworthy. First, the three discriminating variables present a picture that the parents who benefited the most tended to be younger, more highly educated and to have less marital conflict. Second, although parental adjustment level was not selected as part of the predictive equation, it did show a strong group difference ($F = 5.64$, $p < .05$). Thus, to the above description it can also be said that the parents who benefited the most were those who themselves appeared to be better adjusted.

Table 16
Means, Test Scores and Discriminant
Coefficient for Discriminant Analysis

Discriminator Variable	Means		F Score	Standardized Coefficient
	Benefit Least	Benefit Most		
Parent Gender ^a	.64	.74	1.79	
Parent Age	38.08	34.48	10.08***	.75
Parent Education ^b	2.59	2.75	.75	-.25
Gov't Assistance ^c	.17	.14	.27	
Income ^d	.93	1.01	.64	
Adjustment Level ^e	.61	.38	5.64**	
Child Behavior problem ^f	1.65	1.64	.08	
Number Children	2.37	2.12	1.16	
Number Boys	1.28	1.11	1.18	
Number Girls	1.09	0.99	.42	
Number Preschool	.60	.80	2.54	
Number Elem. School	1.00	.80	1.85	
Number Jr./Sr. High	.73	.52	1.67	
Single Parent ^g	.03	.01	.46	
Marital Conflict ^h	1.28	.95	8.68***	.64
Training Type ⁱ	1.19	1.17	.11	

1 Only for variables included in equation

** = $p < .05$, *** = $p < .01$

a 0 = M, 1 = F

b 0 = up to 8th Grade, 1 = Some high school, 2 = H. S. Diploma,
3 = Some College, 4 = College Degree

c 0 = No, 1 = Yes

d 0 = Low, 1 = Middle, 2 = High

e 0 = Normal, 1 = Mildly Disturbed, 2 = Very Disturbed

f 0 = None, 1 = Some, 2 = Many, 3 = Very Many

g 0 = Married, 1 = Single

h 0 = None, 1 = Low, 2 = High

i 0 = Standard Group, 1 = Non-Standard Group, 2 = Individual Training

It is also interesting that none of the child variables played a role in which parents seemed to benefit the most. Neither the level of child behavior problems nor the number and ages of the children seemed important. It is also interesting to observe that both groups of parents had children with many behavior problems.

Table 17

Predicted Classification for Parents Who
Benefit Most and Least from Parent Training

Actual Classification	Predicted Classification*	
	Least Benefit	Most Benefit
Least Benefit (N=78)	70.5%	29.5%
Most Benefit (N=86)	31.4%	68.6%

* Overall correct classification = 69.5% (canonical correlation = .34; Wilks Lambda = .89; X^2 (3) = 18.87, p .0003)

Parental Need for Child-Related Information. The graduates were also asked whether the parents they had trained needed information about various aspects of child development and school and community life. They were asked if the parents needed information on physical health and sickness (information on how the body works, how to detect diseases, how to deliver first aide), practical day-to-day activities (information about toilet training, crying, diapering, bathing, feeding, weaning or playing with children), general child development (information on heredity, birthing, children's motor, cognitive or social abilities at different developmental stages), social relations in the home and community (information about preparing children for new siblings, explaining or understanding death and sexual issues, or understanding and dealing with the school), children with special problems (information about children's anxieties or fears, bedwetting, behavior problems, or about physically, visually or hearing handicapped children) and community resources (information about babysitting resources, child care, housing, employment, health care, legal aide, or education). The graduates were also asked to indicate whether the parents who needed these types of information had preschool, elementary school or junior/senior high school children.

The relevant data is summarized in Table 18. It reflects a consistent developmental trend: parental informational needs vary with the child's age. With young preschool children, parents most need information concerning practical day-to-day activities and general child development. With elementary school children these needs change to school relations, children with special problems, community resources and general child development. With adolescents, very few of the trained parents apparently needed any of these types of information, although half needed assistance with school relations.

Table 18
Percentage of Graduates Indicating That
Parents Who They Trained Needed Various
Types of Child-Related Information Regarding
Their Preschool, Elementary School and
Junior/Senior High School Children
(1977 Cycle, N=30 Graduates)
(1978 Cycle, N=35 Graduates)

Types of Information Needs	Preschool			Elementary School			Junior/Senior High School		
	1977 Cycle	1978 Cycle	Total	1977 Cycle	1978 Cycle	Total	1977 Cycle	1978 Cycle	Total
Physical Health and Sickness	28%	26%	27%	19%	16%	17%	6%	13%	10%
Practical Day-to- Day Activities	59%	58%	59%	28%	32%	30%	3%	16%	10%
General Child Development	53%	77%	65%	41%	61%	51%	16%	23%	19%
School Relations in Home and Community	34%	32%	33%	63%	64%	63%	47%	48%	48%
Children with Special Problems	56%	35%	46%	66%	55%	60%	41%	32%	36%
Community Resources	56%	23%	40%	59%	35%	48%	41%	29%	35%

2. Expansion Phase

Expanded Phase Conference, 1980 This conference and the entire 1980 training cycle was governed by a different training agreement. Conference participation was on an invited basis and only those agencies who were represented at the conference were eligible to nominate staff members for the entire training cycle. There were no fees charged for the conference or for the rest of the training cycle.

In addition to this more attractive training agreement, there were other factors that were working in favor of this conference being more successful than the pilot phase conferences. CICC had become recognized as a major provider of these types of continuing education events. Because of the productivity of many of the graduates of the pilot phase, parent training was becoming better known as a useful community service. CICC had also developed a strong relationship to the County Mental Health Department during the one year period between the end of the pilot phase and the start of the expanded phase cycles. It had done this by arranging meetings with key persons in the central office of the department who had heard about the program through the work of one of the pilot phase graduates who worked at a County mental health clinic. That was the social worker who ended up training other staff members to deliver parenting services. Central office became a major supporter of this training cycle and had decided to allow staff members from all of the County clinics to attend the conference.

All of this resulted in such overwhelming agency response that the conference location had to be changed to accomodate a larger audience. The event was switched from a conference room at a community mental health center to a hall at the Ambassador Hotel. A total of 250 persons from 113 different agencies and clinics attended. This was more than three times the number of persons who attended either of the pilot phase conferences.

As can be seen in Table 19, the participants were mainly women and mainly social workers. All mental health professions were represented including psychiatry. In terms of agency representation, the mental health agencies were in the vast majority. All of the County mental health clinics were presented as was central office. Administrative personnel from various California State agencies were also in attendance.

The impact of the conference was judged in terms of the attendee's ratings of what they got out of the conference and whether agencies who were represented actually took the time and care to nominate staff members for the entire training cycle. Ratings were comparable

to those of the pilot phase conferences, with the vast majority finding the conference to be useful for their day-to-day agency work.

Table 19

1980 Conference Participants:
Gender, Agency Classification, Professions

	N=250	%
Gender		
Female	187	75
Male	63	25
Agencies		
Mental Health	164	66
Education	42	16
Social Service	34	14
Other	10	4
Professions		
Social Workers	124	49
Psychologists	39	16
Counselors	35	14
Educators	22	9
Nurses	14	6
Psychiatrists	9	3
Other	7	3

The agencies ended up nominating nearly twice as many persons as there were training slots. It had been announced that 10 persons per workshop would be selected (30 total) and the agencies nominated fifty five persons. This happy result meant that some agencies had to be turned down, and that more than 30 persons were eventually selected. Selecting more than 30 was done to accomodate the large number of nominations and to anticipate attrition. The County mental health department participated in a systematic fashion as it nominated at least one staff person from each of the mental health regions and at

least one person per region was selected.

Selection was based on the information which the agency and the nominated staff person had supplied on the new application forms (see Appendix). The major selection criteria ended up being (a) the extent to which the nominated person indicated a strong interest in parent training, job responsibilities that would facilitate the opportunity to run parent training groups, and relevant previous experiences such as having received some earlier related training, and (b) the extent to which the agency was willing to commit resources to insure that their staff member would have the opportunity to use his or her training and especially to use it to conduct parent training groups.

Clearly, this conference was a great success because of the numbers of persons attending, their immediate reactions to the conference, and the fact that the attending agencies nominated enough staff persons to fill all of the training slots.

This conference, as well as the two pilot phase conferences, was also intended to provide a basis for choosing which of the three parenting approaches one would want to be trained to deliver. The presentations made by the advocates of each approach seemed to be influential in this regard. Dr. Gordon's presentations were rated the highest at all conferences and enrollment and nominations for the P.E.T. workshops were always the highest. The adverse impact that the presentations could have was illustrated by the response to the presentation on the behavioral approach that was made at the first pilot phase conference. That presenter engaged in a somewhat combative relationship with a skeptical audience and hardly any of them enrolled in that workshop. The presenters for the behavioral approaches at the second pilot phase and expanded phase conference were much more gentle and self-assured and more people enrolled and were nominated in those cycles. This implies that program replicators need to be very careful in who they choose to deliver the presentations and how the presentations are delivered.

Anecdotal data from persons who attended the conferences and who subsequently enrolled or were selected into workshops revealed that some had made their choices on the basis of their client population, their personal or theoretical predilections, and/or practical

considerations. A social worker who worked in a child guidance clinic that saw many hyperactive children choose the behavioral approach because it offered concrete techniques for helping parents to provide greater structure to their children's home environment. Others choose the approach that most mirrored how they were raising their own children or which was sympathetic to their theoretical orientation to human services. Practical considerations included not being able to get off work on the dates and times that a particular workshop was offered so that a preferred workshop could not be attended.

Expansion Phase Cycles, 1980 and 1981 The 1980 training cycle drew all of its participants from agencies who attended the 1980 parenting conference. That cycle was directed primarily at mental health agencies.

The 1981 cycle was directed at early childhood education agencies and schools (Head Start agencies, nursery schools, day care centers, child care centers, and public school districts) and it did not have a parenting conference. Instead, all early childhood education and public school districts were alerted to the availability of the training cycle and were mailed the training cycle enrollment document (see Appendix). Very few choose to nominate staff persons so the cycle was opened up to social service and mental health agencies. The main reasons for the early childhood agencies not participating in large numbers had to do with the fact that most nursery schools and day care centers only have two or three people to run them and they cannot easily release someone to attend training sessions that take place during their operating hours. If the training events had been scheduled in the evening or on weekends, there probably would have been greater participation from these agencies.

Table 20 contains information on the gender, agencies and professions of the 1980 and 1981 training cycle participants. As had been true in the pilot phase cycles, women were in the vast majority in these cycles also. The 1980 cycle consisted primarily of social workers from mental health agencies, and half of them worked for county mental health clinics.

Table 20

1980 and 1981 Training Cycle Participants:
Gender, Agency Classification, Professions

	1980 Cycle		1981 Cycle	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Gender</u>				
Female	25	81	29	88
Male	6	19	4	12
<u>Agencies</u>				
Mental Health	27	87	6	18
Social Service	0	0	12	36
Education	1	3	11	33
Other	3	10	4	12
<u>Profession</u>				
Psychiatry	0	0	0	0
Psychology	5	16	7	21
Social Work	20	64	8	24
Education	0	0	6	18
Counseling	3	10	2	6
Nursing	2	7	2	6
Other	1	3	8	24

The 1981 participants were a much more heterogeneous group. In terms of agencies, 70% were from education and social services. The educational agencies included Head Start and public schools and two nursery schools. The social service agencies included child protective services and family service agencies. The educational backgrounds of these participants were extremely varied. Their backgrounds ranged from a school psychologist with a doctorate to a Head Start parent involvement coordinator who had never attended college. Whereas only 13% of the 1980 cycle participants did not have masters or higher degrees, 41% of the 1981 participants had educational

backgrounds below the masters. Another differentiating characteristic was that several of the 1981 participants did not have individual caseloads of parents or children. Some were in training and administrative positions, including two persons from protective services who were allowed into the cycle with an understanding that they would train other staff persons rather than parents.

The data on the impact of these cycles came from evaluations of each of the training events (the workshops, the implementation seminar and the parent development course) and from a follow up interview that took place six months after the end of the cycles.

Intensive Workshops. These multiple session training events were the primary vehicles for learning the competencies (the ideas and skills) to conduct group parent training programs within agencies. The workshops consisted of basis training sessions for several consecutive weeks followed a month and two months later by supervision sessions to aid in the running of the groups.

Attendance was generally very high. The average percentage of attendance at all of the training sessions for the 1980 workshops was 93.6%, with the most variable attendance coming from the P.E.T. workshop. The average percentage of attendance was 91.4% for all of the sessions of the 1981 workshops and there was very little between workshop variation.

To assess the degree of competency obtained by the workshop participants, they were administered content exams about their program's ideas and methods on the last day of the basic training sessions. The workshop trainers also completed an extensive evaluation of each participant at the end of the supervision sessions. The content exams and the trainer evaluation forms are available in the Appendix.

Table 21 contains the mean content exam scores for each workshop in both cycles. The average scores tended to be high and the greatest variability was with the 1981 STEP and Confident Parenting workshops. Recall that the 1981 cycle had several participants with low educational backgrounds, and some of these were in those workshops which may help account for the high variability in these two workshops.

A total of six participants from the 1981 STEP and Confident Parenting workshops, three per workshop, had exam scores that were less than 70 and therefore were considered to have failed the exam. The vast majority of all workshop participants scored higher than 70. Thus, it can be concluded that on the basis of this measure of participant competency, a large majority of workshop participants (91%) demonstrated that they had attained much of the knowledge that is required to conduct parent training programs.

Table 21

Intensive Workshop Content Exam
Scores for 1980 and 1981 Workshop
Participants

<u>1980 Workshops</u>	N	Mean	S	Range
PET	9	84.9	10.1	71-98
STEP	11	80.8	6.6	75-95
CP	11	84.6	8.4	70-96
 <u>1981 Workshops</u>				
PET	9	87.4	7.5	77-98
STEP	11	76.7	13.6	51-93
CP	13	79.3	12.4	58-92

The trainer evaluations consisted of rating each trainee on a series of dimensions which the workshop trainers agreed were the most important for leading and conducting parenting groups. Recall that during the pilot phase cycles the trainers were asked to give global evaluations of each trainee which were assumed to encompass the important dimensions. For the expansion cycles, the trainers were asked to explicate the dimensions that were latent in their pilot phase evaluations. The result was three general dimensions: (1) enthusiasm of trainee, (2) trainee commitment to the child rearing and human relationship principles of the particular approach, and

(3) trainee commitment to actually conducting parenting classes, and four leadership dimensions, (1) confidence and poise, (2) ability to communicate concepts, (3) ability to promote and facilitate group discussion, and (4) ability to use printed materials appropriately. The trainers rated each trainee on each of these dimensions, using a five point scale (5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = fair, 1 = poor).

The trainers were also asked to use a similar rating scale to indicate how well each trainee had comprehended each parenting skill that was taught in the workshops and how well they will be able to teach or implement each parenting skill.

Tables 22, 23 and 24 contain the mean trainer ratings on all competency dimensions for the P.E.T., STEP and Confident Parenting workshops for both the 1980 and 1981 training cycles.

Table 22 shows that the 1981 P.E.T. workshop participants were rated consistently higher on all dimensions than the 1980 participants. The 1980 participants did not attend as regularly and they were not seen as having developed the desired attributes and skills to as high a degree. On 36% of the dimensions, the 1980 participants had mean ratings below 3.5 whereas the 1981 participants only had 6% below that figure. In terms of consistency between the workshops, there were three specific skill dimensions on which the participants in both of the workshops appeared to excel: active listening, modifying the environment, and becoming a better model. Their mean ratings for comprehending and implementing these parenting strategies or skills were generally the highest.

Table 23 on the STEP workshops reveals a different pattern of results. Here it was the 1980 participants who were rated higher. In addition, there were no dimensions on which the 1980 participants recieved a mean rating of less than 3.5 whereas such low ratings were evident on 28% of the dimensions for the 1981 participants. In terms of consistently high ratings between the two workshops, participants in both of the STEP workshops tended to excel in the understanding and use of encouragement and reflective listening.

Table 22
Trainer Ratings for 1980 and 1981
P.E.T. Workshop Participants

Competency Dimensions	1980 Workshop (N=9)	1981 Workshop (N=9)
<u>General</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Enthusiasm	3.9	(+) 4.7
Commitment to Approach	3.2	(+) 4.3
Commitment to Conduct Classes	3.7	(+) 4.3
<u>Leadership Skills</u>		
Confidence and Poise	3.7	(+) 4.1
Communicates Concepts	3.3	(+) 3.9
Group Facilitation	3.1	(+) 4.6
Printed Material Usage	3.4	(+) 4.0
<u>Teaching Specific Skills</u>		
	Comprehend <u>Mean</u>	Implement <u>Mean</u>
Behavior Rectangle	3.8	3.2
Problem Ownership	3.7	3.3
Active Listening	(+) 4.3	(+) 4.3
I-Messages	3.9	3.7
Positive I-Messages	3.7	3.7
Modifying Environment	4.2	4.3
Method I and II Distinction	3.0	3.0
Method III	3.6	3.1
Becoming a Better Model	4.3	4.2
Becoming a Consultant	3.5	3.4
Modifying Self	3.6	3.6
P.E. Objectives	3.6	3.4
P.E. Philosophy	3.8	3.3

(+) = The workshop with the higher rating on a particular dimension.

Table 23

Trainer Ratings for 1980 and 1981
STEP Workshop Participants

Competency Dimensions	1980 Workshop (N=11)	1981 Workshop (N=11)		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
<u>General</u>				
Enthusiasm	(+) 4.2	4.1		
Commitment to Approach	(+) 4.0	3.7		
Commitment to Conduct Classes	(+) 4.0	3.6		
<u>Leadership Skills</u>				
Confidence and Poise	3.7	(+) 3.8		
Communicates Concepts	(+) 3.5	3.3		
Group Facilitation	(+) 4.2	3.9		
Printed Material Usage	(+) 4.5	3.5		
<u>Teaching Specific Skills</u>				
	<u>Comprehend</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Implement</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Comprehend</u> <u>Mean</u>	<u>Implement</u> <u>Mean</u>
Goals of Misbehavior	3.6	3.6	(+) 3.9	(+) 4.4
Goals of Positive Behavior	(+) 3.5	3.6	3.1	(+) 3.9
Encouragement	(+) 4.5	(+) 4.5	3.7	4.3
Reflective Listening	(+) 4.0	(+) 4.0	3.5	4.3
Problem Ownership	(+) 3.8	(+) 4.1	2.9	3.7
Exploring Alternatives	(+) 3.8	(+ 4.1	3.4	4.0
I-Messages	(+) 3.8	(+) 4.1	3.1	3.8
Natural and Logical Consequences	(+) 3.5	3.5	3.3	(+) 4.0
Family Meetings	(+) 3.9	(+) 4.3	3.4	4.0

(+) = The workshop with the higher rating on a particular dimension.

Table 24
Trainer Ratings for 1980 and 1981
Confident Parenting Workshop Participants

Competency Dimensions	1980 Workshop (N=11)	1981 Workshop (N=13)		
<u>General</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
Trainee Enthusiasm	3.9	(+) 4.0		
Commitment to Approach	3.8	3.8		
Commitment to Conducting Classes	(+) 3.8	3.6		
 <u>Leadership Skills</u>				
Confidence and Poise	3.6	3.6		
Concept Communication	3.5	(+) 3.9		
Group Facilitation	(+) 4.0	3.8		
Printed Material Usage	(+) 4.1	3.8		
 <u>Teaching Specific Skills</u>				
	<u>Comprehend Mean</u>	<u>Implement Mean</u>	<u>Comprehend Mean</u>	<u>Implement Mean</u>
Behavior Analysis	(+) 3.8	(+) 3.7	3.7	3.6
Praise	4.5	4.5	(+) 4.6	4.5
Mild Social Punishment	(+) 4.4	(+) 4.4	3.4	3.2
Ignoring	(+) 4.3	(+) 4.3	3.7	3.2
Time-Out	(+) 4.2	(+) 4.2	3.7	3.5
Incentive Systems	3.7	3.6	3.7	(+) 3.7
Contracting	3.5	3.4	3.5	(+) 3.5
Devising Behavior Change Projects	(+) 3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8

(+) = The workshop with a higher rating on a particular dimension.

A third pattern of results is evident in Table 24 for the Confident Parenting workshops. While the 1980 participants were generally rated higher, there were six dimensions where the ratings were identical and several others where there were only slight differences. In terms of rating below a mean of 3.5, the 1980 participants had only low ratings on 4% of the dimensions and the 1981 participants on just 13%. The highest and most consistent ratings for both workshops was on the comprehension and implementation of the praising skill.

In terms of the total number of dimensions on which workshop participants were rated below 3.5 (1980 and 1981 workshops combined), the P.E.T. workshops had 21% low ratings, STEP had 14% and Confident Parenting had 9%. This appears to indicate that the Confident Parenting workshop was the most consistently effective workshop in preparing its participants to run its particular parenting programs, and that P.E.T. was the least effective. However, the lower overall scores for P.E.T. came mainly from the 1980 workshop where there was so much attendance variability and therefore the lower scores may simply represent an unusual circumstance. Without consistent attendance it is very hard for the participant to demonstrate to the trainer that they are developing the necessary attributes and skills and the trainer would quite naturally give lower ratings.

Thus far the trainer ratings have been discussed in terms of group issues. What do the ratings tell us about individuals? Can they be used to determine how many of the workshop participants would be considered as adequately prepared to deliver the parenting programs? Recall that global trainer ratings of the pilot phase workshop participants were used to arrive at a determination that approximately 80% of those workshop participants were adequately prepared.

Assuming that ratings of "excellent," "very good," and "good" indicate that a participant is adequately prepared, combining these high ratings can reveal the numbers of adequately prepared participants for each workshop. Table 25 contains the percentages of high ratings on the competency dimensions that make up the three major

categories of competencies, and the overall percentages of high ratings on all competency dimensions. It shows that, depending upon the workshop, anywhere from 81% to 94% of the ratings on all competency dimensions were high. This can be interpreted to mean that these percentages of individuals per workshop were adequately prepared, which represents higher percentages than those who were considered to be adequately prepared in the pilot phase workshops.

Table 25
Percentage of High Ratings Within Competency
Categories for 1980 and 1981 Workshop Participants

Workshops	Competency Categories							
	General		Leadership		Specific Skills ^a		Overall	
	N ^b	%	N ^b	%	N ^b	%	N ^c	%
<u>P.E.T. Workshops</u>								
1980	27	81%	36	86%	234	81%	297	81%
1981	27	96%	36	100%	234	93%	297	94%
<u>STEP Workshops</u>								
1980	33	91%	44	86%	198	91%	275	91%
1981	33	97%	44	89%	198	83%	275	85%
<u>C.P. Workshops</u>								
1980	33	82%	44	89%	176	97%	253	94%
1981	39	85%	52	94%	208	94%	299	93%

a = Includes the ratings for competency and implementation for each specific skill.

b = N is the number of dimensions within each competency category multiplied by the number of participants who were rated on each dimension within that category. For example, three dimensions make up the General Category. For the 1980 P.E.T. workshop there were 9 participants rated on each of the three dimensions. Thus, N=27.

c = Here N consists of all of the evaluative dimensions that constitute the three major Competency Categories multiplied by the number of participants who are rated on all of these dimensions. For example, there were 33 total dimensions within the three major categories for P.E.T.. Multiplied by the 9 participants who were rated on these dimensions results in an N of 297.

Implementation Seminars. These seminars took place toward the end of the intensive workshops. They were for the workshop participants and an administrator from their agencies. They were designed to assist in the process of implementing and maintaining parenting programs within the agencies.

The 1980 and 1981 seminars were attended by 87% of the workshop participants and 60% of their agencies sent administrators. However, more than 60% of the agencies actually had administrators in attendance because some of the workshop participants were also service administrators in their agencies.

At the close of these seminars, the participants were asked to complete an evaluation form that allowed for both rated and written assessments of the value of the seminar (see Appendix). The participants rated the value of the entire seminar and of the topics which were covered on a five point scale, where "1" indicated negative value, "3" neutral, and "5" as highly valuable. Table 26 contains the percentages of participating trainers who rated the seminar and its topics as being of high value (scale ratings "4" and "5" combined). It shows that 90% of the trainers found the entire seminar to be highly valuable.

Table 26 also contains the comparable percentages for the agency administrators who attended the seminar. Since some agencies had more than one trainer in the program, some administrators represented more than one trainer. The data in Table 26 indicates that the vast majority of administrators also found the seminar to be highly valuable.

Written comments from the participants indicated that the implementation seminar document was extremely valuable and that its discussion in the seminar brought certain issues to life and allowed for a sharing of how different agencies would approach the issues. Many of the participants commented on how helpful this across-agency sharing was. A few indicated that the document itself was thorough enough so as not to have to be discussed at a seminar.

The exercise of creating a Plan for Generating and Maintaining Parenting Classes was very well received. It forced the participants

to look at all of the little and big things that needed to be accomplished in order to get a class started. Several administrators commented on how this exercise, and the entire seminar, crystallized for them how very important their roles and resources were in starting and running agency-based classes. The seminar also seemed to stimulate them to begin planning their classes as soon as possible.

Table 26

Trainers and Administrators Ratings of Implementation Seminar:
Percentage Indicating High Value

Questions	<u>1980 Seminar</u>		<u>1981 Seminar</u>	
	Trainers (N=28)	Admin. (N=13)	Trainers (N=28)	Admin. (N=16)
1. Overall Seminar	90%	92%	90%	86%
2. Seminar Topics				
A. CICC-Agency Agreement	90%	92%	71%	81%
B. Definitions	84%	92%	81%	69%
C. Gaining Agency Support	94%	85%	81%	94%
D. Generating Classes	94%	100%	87%	100%
E. Conducting Classes	94%	100%	87%	63%
F. Funding of Classes	65%	77%	74%	63%

There was clearly a greater sense of shared responsibility generated from the seminar. The administrators became much better informed about parent training and the problems involved in delivering group parent training services. The trainers also became better informed and possibly better understood.

As part of the follow up interview that took place six months after the end of the entire training program, the graduates were asked a series of questions that related to many of the issues covered in the implementation seminars. The interviewer said to them: "In the following section, I will be asking you questions about implementing and maintaining parent training programs. From all facets of the

parent training program (workshop, Implementation Seminar, Parent Development Course) did you receive sufficient information and/or training on _ _ _ _." The remaining parts of this question dealt with the program implementation and marketing issues that are listed in Table 27. The graduates either indicated "yes" or "no" in terms of whether they received sufficient training and/or information to deal with these issues, and Table 27 contains the percentage of graduates who said they did receive sufficient training and/or information.

The data in Table 27 reflects that the majority of graduates of both cycles felt that they had received sufficient preparation to deal with all of these issues. This is further data on the effectiveness or importance of the Implementation Seminar, though the seminar was not the only training event in which these issues were discussed.

It is also important to consider that these high percentages do not necessarily mean that the graduates do not need additional assistance on these issues. Nationwide organizations that have a proprietary interest in generating parent training groups, such as the Effectiveness Training organization that promotes P.E.T. and American Guidance Services that sells the STEP program, spend a great deal of time in giving parent trainers an array of ideas on how to market parent training. The graduates of this program, while clearly seeing themselves as being prepared to deal with these issues, no doubt could benefit from the continual sharing of marketing ideas that takes place with national proprietary organizations.

Parent Development Courses. These multiple session classes took place after the Implementation Seminars and after the basic training sessions of the intensive workshops. The first sessions of the Parent Development course took place during the period when the intensive workshop supervision sessions were happening, so they overlapped with those activities. The last sessions of this course did not overlap with any other training activities and they constituted the end of the training cycles.

The course itself was designed to provide education and materials that related to several topic areas that the pilot phase

Table 27

Graduate Assessment of Training Program
In Terms of Preparing Them to Deal With
Implementation and Marketing Issues:
Percentage Indicating That They Received
Sufficient Training To Manage These Issues

Implementation and Marketing Issues	1980 Cycle Graduates (N=31)	1981 Cycle Graduates (N=33)
Delivering Parent Training Presentations to Agency Staff	77%	82%
Approaching Supervisors About Starting Parent Training Groups	84%	94%
Negotiating With Supervisors	84%	91%
Obtaining In-House Referrals	71%	76%
Obtaining Referrals from Other Agencies	68%	61%
Assistance in Advertising, Publicizing and Promoting Parent Training	87%	88%
Generating Interest in Parent Training Groups in Lay Community	71%	67%
Generating Interest in Other Agencies	58%	54%
Maintaining Parent Attendance	77%	85%
Extending Group Beyond Standard Sessions	55%	67%

graduates had indicated were important for parenting instructors. The basic topic areas that were addressed were parent and child co-development, parental functions and responsibilities, child abuse, and cultural issues in child rearing. These topics were covered somewhat differently in the 1980 and 1981 courses, as was indicated earlier in the description of the Parent Development course.

The impact of the courses was evaluated through several

procedures. Some procedures were only used with the 1980 course and others were used for both courses. In addition, there was a series of questions about the course that was asked during the six month follow up interview.

During the 1980 course, the trainees completed session-by-session evaluation forms (see Appendix). The data from these forms, which reflected how the content and processes of each session was being received in terms of usefulness for parent training, was used as the primary basis for modifying the format and content of the 1981 course. At the end of the 1980 course, the trainees were asked to rate the total course in terms of whether the course helped prepare them for delivering parenting services. They were told that "the overall goal of the course was to better prepare you to be an effective parent trainer by supplying you with information and ideas (a) to assist you in understanding the needs and perspectives of various groups of parents and (b) to clarify your responsibilities as a parent trainer." They were asked to compare "where you were when you began the course and to rate the degree to which you are now better prepared as a parent trainer."

Table 28 contains the categories of preparedness and the percentage of trainees who rated themselves within these categories. It shows that 91% of the trainees considered themselves as "better" to "much better" prepared.

Table 28

Trainees Rating of Impact of 1980 Parent Development Course:
Percentage Indicating Degree to which Course Better Prepared
Them to Deliver Parenting Services

Preparation Designation	Not Better Prepared		Better Prepared		Much Better Prepared
Scale Designation	1	2	3	4	5
PET (N=9)	0%	0%	11%	44%	44%
STEP (N=11)	0%	0%	64%	0%	36%
CP (N=11)	18%	9%	18%	18%	36%
Totals	6%	3%	32%	19%	39%

The trainees were also asked to complete written projects that related to the content of the course. The project for the 1980 course was a developmental chart where the trainees indicated what were the major child rearing issues of each child developmental stage, how their parenting program could assist parents with these issues, and how the issues might be different for ethnic minority parents. The project for the 1981 trainees was a series of essay questions on course content and issues (see Appendix). There was a great deal of variability on the part of both 1980 and 1981 trainees in how they performed on these written projects. Some performed amazingly well and produced written projects that were of such high practical quality that they could be used as part of parenting classes. Others completed the written projects with little available energy or enthusiasm and felt burdened by being asked to do them. The quality of their projects were of marginal value.

At the follow up interview that took place six months after the course had ended, they were asked a series of questions that had to do with their actual use of the course ideas and materials. Table 29 contains the percentage of 1980 and 1981 graduates who indicated that they used the course ideas and materials as part of the parenting services that they had been delivering. It shows that 69% had actually made direct use of the course, 19% had not, and 12% had not had the opportunity to do so. When questioned about what aspects of the course that they had actually used, the most frequently cited features were information on child development stages and tasks, and information on parental functions and responsibilities. Features which were mentioned less frequently included information on cultural and class issues in child rearing, parental expectations, child's cognitive development, and discussions of corporal punishment and cultural and class differences in the use of corporal punishment. The graduates indicated that the course materials that they had found to be most useful were (a) the chart that described the 5 Part Model of Parental Functions and Responsibilities, (b) the Child's Body book and charts on child development, and (c) the Family Development chart that was used in the 1981 course.

Table 29

Parent Development Course Ideas and Materials:
Percentage of Graduates Indicating Use as Part of
Delivering Parenting Services

Cycle/Workshops	Yes	No	Not Appropriate ^a
<u>1980 Training Cycle</u>			
PET (N=9)	66%	11%	22%
STEP (N=11)	82%	18%	0%
CP (N=11)	55%	36%	9%
Totals (N=31)	68%	22%	10%
<u>1981 training Cycle</u>			
PET (N=9)	66%	22%	11%
STEP (N=11)	73%	0%	27%
CP (N=13)	69%	23%	7%
Totals (N=33)	70%	15%	14%
<u>1980 and 1981 Cycles</u>			
Combined (N=64) Totals	69%	19%	12%

a Not appropriate means either that the graduate was not delivering services to parents or that the opportunity to use the ideas and materials had not yet occurred by the time of the six month follow up.

Overall, it appears that the majority of graduates made good practical use of the Parent Development course, and that they tended to use certain features in a regular fashion and some in a more idiosyncratic matter that seemed to be related to the types of parents that they were working with. Clearly, the course added to the preparation and useful knowledge base of the majority of graduates of both training cycles.

Follow Up Interviews As has been indicated, the graduates of both cycles were interviewed six months after the cycles ended. All

graduates were available for this extensive telephone interview (see Appendix).

Sufficiency of Training. The graduates were asked to rate the overall sufficiency of the training program for preparing them to be parent trainers. They were asked: "Now that a substantial time has elapsed since your training program ended, we would like to know if the program provided you with sufficient preparation to be an effective parent trainer. On a 1 to 5 scale, please indicate how sufficient your preparation was, with '1' indicating Insufficient and '5' indicating Sufficient."

Table 30 contains the ratings of the 1980 and 1981 workshop graduates and the combined ratings of the graduates of the two pilot phase cycles. It shows that the mean sufficiency ratings were higher for the graduates of both the 1980 and 1981 training cycles, which can be interpreted to mean that they felt better prepared in general. These

Table 30

Graduate Assessment of Training Program
In Terms of Preparing Them Sufficiently
to be Parent Trainers

Sufficiency of Training	Pilot Phase Graduates (N=65)	1980 Cycle Graduates (N=31)	1981 Cycle Graduates (N=33)
5 = Sufficient	19%	3%	31%
4	35%	42%	41%
3	32%	48%	22%
2	11%	3%	3%
1 = Insufficient	3%	3%	3%
Mean Rating	3.56	4.30	3.94

graduates were also in a better position to evaluate overall preparedness because more of the critical issues in conducting parent training programs were attended to in their training cycles. Thus, their ratings may be better informed by a fuller understanding of what it means to be an effective parent trainer.

The data in Table 30 also indicates that only 3% of the 1980 graduates indicated that their training was maximally sufficient (rating of "5") where 31% of the 1981 graduates indicated maximum sufficiency. This may indicate that the 1981 cycle, which was modified somewhat on the basis of feedback from the 1980 cycle participants, was indeed a more thorough training cycle.

Agency Support. In addition to the original questions about agency support and agency attitudes toward parent training that were asked of the pilot phase graduates at their follow up interviews, several new questions were added to the expansion phase interviews.

Table 31 contains the relevant data. It indicates that on every dimension of agency support the expansion phase graduates received more support, and that three to four times as many expansion phase agencies added parent training to their on-going services. The results also show that the expansion graduates assessed their agencies as valuing parent training more highly and as planning to provide greater future support for parent training.

The 1980 graduates tended to receive more agency support than the 1981 graduates, and especially in terms of the resourcefulness of their agencies in developing funding for parent training services and materials. The 1980 cycle was composed almost entirely of mental health agencies and the majority of these were county mental health clinics. The extra work that CICC had done with county central office regarding financial support apparently paid off. The ideas regarding financial assistance were shared, however, with all participants through the Implementation Seminars. Apparently, it was easier for the mental health agencies to utilize these ideas.

The overall results on the agency support that the expansion phase trainers received is strong evidence that the new contractual arrangements and the required involvement of the agencies in the entire training cycles paid very handsome dividends. Clearly, the expansion phase trainers received markedly greater support and the agencies themselves became more committed to parent training.

Table 31
Percentage of Graduates Receiving Agency
Support and Graduate Assessment of
Agency Attitudes Toward Parent Training:
All Training Cycles

Agency Support and Attitudes	1977 and 1978 Training Cycles (N=65)	1980 Cycle (N=31)	1981 Cycle (N=33)
<u>Support</u>			
Provided Release Time	42%	87%	88%
Provided Administrative Help	57%	84%	73%
Training Program used as Topic for In-Service	30%	48%	46%
Purchased Training Materials	41%	90%	54%
Agency Funds	NA	48%	36%
Charged Parents	NA	36%	30%
Both	NA	19%	0%
Provided Parent Support ^a	24%	61%	52%
Provided Advertising ^b	NA	55%	67%
Added Parent Training Program to Agency Services	20%	84%	70%
Funding for Services:			
Charged Parents	NA	58%	15%
Reimbursement Contract	NA	39%	0%
Insurance Companies	NA	13%	6%
Other Contracts	NA	23%	21%
<u>Attitudes (Mean Scores)^c</u>			
Value Parent Training As a Community Service	3.43	3.90	4.18
Planning to Provide Future Support for Parent Training	2.82	3.63	3.52

NA = Not Asked

a = Includes providing refreshments, child care and transportation.

b = Includes creating and disseminating brochures, flyers and newspaper stories and advertising.

c = The scale was: 1=Not at all, 2=Very little, 3=Average, 4=Very much, 5=Extremely.

Utilization of Training. A large portion of the follow up interview was devoted to exploring the types of use that the graduates make of their training and the numbers of persons who they impacted through these uses. Since agency support was one of the major predictors of utilization for the pilot phase graduates, and since the expansion phase graduates received much greater support, it would be expected that the expansion phase graduates would make greater use, in general, of their training.

Table 32 indicates the percentage of graduates who engaged in each type of utilization. It shows that eighty to ninety percent of the graduates had conducted parent training groups. This far exceeds the percent of pilot phase graduates who had conducted groups at either of the phases' follow ups (see Table 9). Thus, the expanded phase was much more successful in stimulating more of its graduates to conduct groups.

Table 32 also demonstrates that there was between cycle variability in percentage of graduates who trained parents on an individual basis and who trained parents as part of other services. Hardly any graduate from the 1981 cycle trained parents on an individual basis whereas about a third of the 1980 graduates did. Twenty percent more graduates from the 1980 cycle also reported training parents as part of other services. These differences are probably due to the different job responsibilities of many of the 1981 graduates which were mentioned earlier.

Another noteworthy result from Table 32 is the high percentage of graduates from both cycles who reported that they were training others to use the skills and ideas that they had learned in the training program. As may be recalled, it was this type of utilization that increased dramatically from the follow up to the refollow up for the pilot phase graduates (see Table 9). With the expanded phase cycles, nearly twice as many were engaging in this type of utilization at the follow up. Indeed, the percentages at follow up for these cycle graduates are almost equal to the percentage of pilot phase graduates who were making this type of use at the 18 and 24 month refollow up. Clearly, there was something about the expanded

Table 32

Percentage of 1980 and 1981 Program Graduates
Making Different Types of Utilization at the
Six Month Follow Up

Type of Utilization	1980 Cycle				1981 Cycle			
	PET N=9	STEP N=11	CP N=11	Total N=31	PET N=9	STEP N=11	CP N=13	Total N=33
Trained Parents in Groups	78%	100%	91%	90%	89%	73%	85%	82%
Trained Parents Individually	33%	45%	36%	39%	0%	18%	8%	9%
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	89%	100%	100%	97%	89%	64%	85%	79%
Used Skills Directly With Clients	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	92%	88%
Trained Others to Use Skills	78%	91%	64%	77%	67%	91%	85%	82%
Delivered Presentations	100%	91%	91%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%

phase cycles that promoted this type of utilization very quickly after cycle completion. That "something" may have been a product of the new training agreement. The nominating agencies may have intended or required their participating staff to train others. This was clearly the intention of a few of the agencies as they had nominated staff members from their training departments and had gotten permission from CICC to waive the "train parents in group" criteria (which was the reason that some of these graduates didn't run groups). But there were only two such waivers, so other nominating agencies may have had these as a covert expectation. Another explanation could be that the cycle participants had not thought of using their training in this way but that the program stimulated them to think about it and they found it to be a good idea. Whatever the reasons may have been, it is clear that the majority of expansion phase graduates trained others to use the program skills and ideas.

Table 33

Total Persons Impacted by 1980 and 1981
Training Cycle Graduates at Six Month Follow Up

	Number Graduates	Total Persons Impacted	Impact Per Month	Impact Per Month Per Graduate
<u>1980 Cycle</u>				
PET	9	2668	445	49
STEP	11	1938	323	29
CP	11	2700	450	41
Total	31	7306	1218	$\bar{X}=40$
<u>1981 Cycle</u>				
PET	9	2390	398	44
STEP	11	2225	371	34
CP	13	2208	368	28
Total	33	6823	1137	$\bar{X}=34$

The data on the number of persons who the graduates estimated as impacting through each type of utilization are displayed in Tables 33 and 34. These data reflect that the 1980 cycle was slightly more productive than the 1981 cycle: approximately 80 additional persons were impacted per month by the 1980 cycle graduates. When this total impact data is compared to similar data from the pilot phase cycles (see Tables 8 and 11), both of the expansion phase cycles can be seen as being more productive than the pilot phase cycles. Whereas the graduates of the two pilot phase cycles had impacted 4987 and 4009 persons by their first follow up, the expansion phase graduates had impacted 7306 and 6823 persons. This difference is even more striking when it is recalled that there were more graduates of the pilot phase cycles (81 total graduates for pilot phase, 64 total for expansion phase).

Additional data that points to greater productivity on the part of the expansion phase graduates are contained in Table 35, which shows the number of parenting groups run by the expansion graduates

Table 34

1980 and 1981 Training Cycles: Number of Graduates Engaging in Each Type of Utilization and Number of Persons Who They Estimated as Impacting By the Sixth Month Follow Up

Type of Utilization	A. 1980 Cycle								
	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (Confident Parenting)		
	Graduates (N=9)	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=11)	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=11)	Persons Impacted N	%
Trained Parents in Groups	7	100	4%	11	161	8%	10	309	11%
Trained Parents Individually	3	11	0%	5	9	0%	4	34	1%
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	8	388	15%	11	419	22%	11	634	23%
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	9	1714	64%	11	787	41%	11	1022	38%
Trained Others to Use Skills	7	141	5%	10	151	8%	7	204	8%
Delivered Presentations	9	314	12%	10	411	21%	10	497	18%
Total	9	2668	100%	11	1938	100%	11	2700	100%

Type of Utilization	B. 1981 Cycle								
	Parent Effectiveness Training			Adlerian (STEP)			Social Learning (Confident Parenting)		
	Graduates (N=9)	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=11)	Persons Impacted N	%	Graduates (N=13)	Persons Impacted N	%
Trained Parents in Groups	8	182	8%	8	340	15%	11	236	11%
Trained Parents Individually	0	0	0%	2	3	0%	1	1	0%
Trained Parents as Part of Other Services	8	400	17%	7	366	16%	11	299	14%
Used Skills in Relating Directly to Clients	9	1074	45%	8	709	32%	12	1015	46%
Trained Others to Use Skills	6	197	8%	10	286	13%	11	326	15%
Delivered Presentations	9	537	22%	11	521	23%	13	332	15%
Total	9	2390	100%	11	2225	100%	13	2208	100%

and the number of parents trained in those groups. The comparable data for the pilot phase graduates can be found in Table 12.

Table 35

Number of Parenting Groups and Participating Parents
Reported by 1980 and 1981 Training Cycle Graduates at
Six Month Follow Up

	Number Graduates Interviewed	Number Leading Groups	Number of Groups	Number of Parents
<u>1980 Cycle</u>				
PET	9	7	16	100
STEP	11	11	19	161
CP	11	10	34	309
Total	31	28	69	570
<u>1981 Cycle</u>				
PET	9	8	13	182
STEP	11	8	24	340
CP	13	11	20	236
Total	33	27	47	758

Of the 65 pilot phase graduates who were available for the 18 and 24 month refollow up interviews, 43 of those graduates had conducted a total of 111 groups with a total of 1412 parents (or, prorated, 142 groups with 1637 parents). In less than one third to one fourth the amount of time, the expansion phase graduates nearly equaled those figures. Of the 64 expansion graduates, 55 graduates had run a total of 116 groups for 1328 parents by the time of their 6 month follow up.

Taking this result together with the earlier result on the percentage of graduates who conducted parent training groups, it can be concluded that the expansion phase graduates were much more productive in terms of training parents in groups.

CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Personnel for Parent Development Program is designed as a national training model for educating mental health, social service and educational personnel to deliver specific kinds of group parent training services through their agencies (Alvy and Rubin, 1981; 1979). The program was created by the Center for the Improvement of Child Caring (CICC), a private, non-profit training, service and research corporation located in Los Angeles County. Its development was funded for five years by grants from the Manpower Division of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

The NIMH funding underwrote two years of pilot testing to determine how best to present the program to the target populations and to determine the types of training experiences that are necessary to prepare the personnel for delivering the services in their agencies. What was learned from the pilot test years was incorporated into an expanded training model which was tested for two additional years.

Historical Context

The program came into existence at a historical time when there was keen interest in this type of continuing education program among national authorities on mental health manpower, child mental health services, and child abuse prevention services. The manpower experts were arguing for the retraining of mental health professionals in new ways of role function, such as being trained to deliver prevention-oriented services like parent training (Mental Health of Children, 1973). Child mental health authorities were speaking of parent training as being the number one community service to promote the healthy emotional and mental development of America's children (Mitre Corporation, 1977). They were also realizing that the prevalence of child mental health disorders far exceeded the available personnel and resources for dealing with them, and preventative services like parent training could possibly address these shortages (President's Commission on Mental Health, 1978).

Experts in the child welfare and child abuse fields were coming to the conclusion that parent training services were a necessary component in any treatment program for abusive parents and that the same type of services could play an abuse prevention role when directed toward the general population of American parents (Alvy, 1975; Child Abuse Council of the Education Commission of the States, 1976; DHEW, 1976 a,b,c; Helfer and Kempe, 1974, 1976; Justice and Justice, 1976; Martin, 1976).

At the same time that these conclusions were being drawn, there were technological advances taking place in terms of developing parent training programs that teach specific parenting skills. Programs based on different theoretical underpinnings were being created and tested in a variety of community and agency settings. Some research had even been conducted on the effectiveness of these programs and the results, while not 100% positive, were promising (Tavormina, 1980).

Thus, there appeared to be a clear need for a model continuing education program to train agency personnel to deliver the new parenting skill training programs, and the technology out of which to create such a model program was partially in place. It was for these reasons that NIMH funded the development of the Personnel for Parent Development Program.

But the climate for carrying out such a program was not as positive. Mental health and related professionals were not so willing to be trained in these new ways of role function. Their agency administrators were not even sure if they could afford to allow their staffs to offer parent training services as there was no precedent for third party (State or insurance company) reimbursement for the services. In addition, the tax revolt had started in the state where the program was being tested, California. Public officials were finding it increasingly difficult to support the use of tax dollars for community services, which made it even more unlikely that tax monies would be used to provide continuing education for the professionals who deliver the community services. The most striking example of this zeitgeist phenomenon was the steady and dramatic reduction of California state funding for mental

health services over the period that the program was in operation. These reductions exceeded 20 million dollars. Reductions in social service and educational funds were also occurring at the same time. So the program had to fight professional and agency skepticism and the reality of reduced resources within the human service systems that were to provide the trainees for the program.

During its pilot testing years, the program had another problem on its hands. It was being sponsored by an organization, CICC, that was not at the time an established provider of continuing education for the mental health, social service and educational personnel in Los Angeles. The professionals were accustomed to relating to the state-operated Health Training Center and the County Mental Health Department's Training Section for free continuing education, and CICC had to establish itself as a legitimate provider. This "new kid on the block" problem was overcome with assistance from the established providers, who themselves were fighting the effects of the tax revolt. All continuing education programs were under close scrutiny by fiscally-conscious public officials and, despite this, the established providers were greatly supportive of the new program. By the end of the five years of development of the new program, the Health Training Center had been defunded by the State and County Training Section had been substantially diminished. Thus, it can be concluded that the new program came into existence at a most precarious historical time.

Pilot Testing

With a mixture of enthusiasm and apprehension, the pilot testing was launched in 1977. Three types of parent training programs were chosen to be taught: Tom Gordon's Parent Effectiveness Training which has its theoretical roots in Rogerian Psychology (Gordon, 1970, 1975, 1976); Dinkmeyer and McKay's Systematic Training for Effective Parenting which owes many of its basic assumptions to Adlerian Psychology (Dinkmeyer and McKay, 1976); and Aitchison's Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training Program which is based

on social learning and behavior modification principles (Aitchison and Liberman, 1973; Eimers and Aitchison, 1977).

Each of these programs teaches a philosophy of human relations or child rearing, and a set of child rearing skills. The philosophies and skills are consistent with what is known about the positive impact of parental acceptance or warmth on child growth and development (Alvy, 1981; Bigner, 1979; Coopersmith, 1967; Martin, 1975). The skills include therapeutic listening (active or reflective listening from P.E.T. and STEP), verbal appreciation (behavior-specific praise from Confident Parenting, Positive I-Messages from P.E.T., encouragement from STEP), confrontational disciplinary techniques (I-Messages from P.E.T. and STEP, Mild Social Disapproval from Confident Parenting) and a variety of other problem-solving and family life enhancement skills.

The programs are taught in a standard manner with training exercises and homework assignments for each training session. They run for 8 to 10 weeks, one session per week for two to three hours, and the instructor follows a curriculum from a manual. The parent participants also have a manual or workbook which expands upon the learning and exercises of each highly structured class session.

During the two pilot testing years, the training program consisted of two major events: a one day conference to showcase the three parenting programs and provide a basis for choosing a program to be trained in, and intensive workshops to learn how to deliver programs. The conference included presentations on each program by their originators or by knowledgeable authorities, panel discussions among the presenters regarding the differences and similarities in the programs, question and answer periods with the audience, and the availability of books and other materials on the parenting programs and related topics. The intensive workshops ranged from 23 to 41 hours of training which was spread over a three month period. It included basic training sessions to learn the concepts and techniques of the particular parenting program and these were taught through the use of lecture, discussion, role playing, leader demonstration and

trainee leadership methods. The workshops ended with supervision sessions which were spaced a month apart so that the workshop leader could assist the trainees in establishing and conducting their first parenting class.

Nominal fees were charged for both the conference and the workshops, and continuing education credits were made available for psychologists, social workers and nurses. Conference participants were recruited through a multi-media campaign, and approximately 75 persons attended each conference. The workshops were for 15 persons each and it was hoped that they would be filled by conference participants. The workshop training agreement was between the participants and CICC, the sponsoring organization. While it was hoped that the participants would run parenting programs in their agencies, their agencies were not formally involved in the pilot test training agreement.

The conferences were evaluated in terms of the number and kinds of professionals who attended, their immediate responses to the conference presentations and discussions, their subsequent responses after a three month interval, and how they related to the intensive workshops. The vast majority of conference participants were women and they were a heterogeneous group in terms of agencies and professions represented. The majority came from mental health agencies and were social workers.

They rated the entire conference highly in terms of providing a broader understanding of how parent training interventions could serve as viable additions to traditional psychotherapeutic interventions. Interestingly, the majority of participants represented themselves as already delivering some type of parent training service, though very few indicated that they had received any training to do so.

Twenty seven percent of the conference participants subsequently enrolled in an intensive workshop. The best predictor of which participants enrolled was whether the participants purchased parent training materials at the conferences. Because only twenty seven percent enrolled, which represented 42 of the available 90 workshop training slots, it was necessary to recruit additional workshop

trainees. A special problem in recruitment was how to represent the behavioral workshop, which was underenrolled during the first pilot test year. During the second year, it was given a name that played down its behavioral roots and it was publicized without reference to behavior modification or child management. It was better attended during the second year.

The majority of workshop participants were women and they represented all of the core mental health professions. They came from 60 different agencies and had varied job responsibilities in their agencies.

The workshops were evaluated in terms of whether the participants developed the knowledge and skills to run the particular parent training programs in their agencies, how they actually used their workshop training, and what additional types of training might be necessary.

The workshop trainers assessed 80% of the trainees to have sufficiently learned the information and skills to run the programs. Follow up interviews with the graduates indicated that they made six basic uses of their training and the extent of their use was greatly a function of the kinds of support which they received from their agencies.

The six basic uses were (1) conducting parenting groups, (2) training parents on an individual basis, (3) training parents as part of other services like family therapy, (4) using the workshop skills in relating directly to clients, (5) training others to use the skills, and (6) delivering presentations about parent training before professional and community groups.

Within an average of 4.5 months after termination of the workshops, the graduates estimated that they had impacted as many as 9,000 persons through these six usages, though there was large variability between and within the workshops in terms of estimated usage. Not all the graduates, however, had actually conducted parenting groups which was the main use for which the workshops were to prepare them (only 44 out of the 89 graduates actually were running groups at the time of this initial follow up). The best predictors of how much use the graduates made of their training

and who actually conducted groups was graduate competency and commitment to parent training, and the quantity and quality of agency support which they received or were able to generate.

Longitudinal follow ups 18 to 24 months after the first follow up revealed similar between and within workshop variabilities and a very impressive total number of persons who the graduates estimated as impacting: they estimated that through the six usages they had impacted between 43,000 to 58,000 individuals since the end of their workshop trainings. In terms of groups run, a higher percentage of graduates had run groups by the time of this second follow up but they were not running as many groups as had been run between the end of the workshops and the first follow up. There was a striking result in terms of another type of use. Three quarters to 80% of the graduates reported that they were training other professionals and staff persons to use the workshop skills by the time of the second follow up, whereas only 44% were making this use at the time of the first follow up.

While the estimated number of persons impacted were probably overestimates, the number of persons impacted would still be impressive if only half the amount were actually impacted. The varied uses which the graduates made of their training was also impressive, though less than half ran parenting groups.

When questioned about their needs for additional training, the pilot phase graduates indicated the need for more training in in how to implement and market parenting groups, more education in child development since parents asked them frequently for such information, and some exposure to cultural differences in child rearing since many of their parents were from ethnic minority groups who did not match the parents who were depicted in the training manuals. These graduates also indicated that the parents who seemed to benefit most from parent training tended to be younger, more highly educated, better adjusted, and have more stable marital relations. Interestingly, the extent of their children's behavior problems did not differentiate the parents who benefitted most from those who the graduates indicated had benefitted least.

Expanded training Model

The results of the two pilot testing years were used as a basis for modifying the training agreement and for creating additional training events. The new agreement was to be between the agencies and the sponsoring organization. Conference participation was to be on an invited basis and only those agencies who were represented at the conference were eligible to nominate staff members for the entire training cycle. There were no fees charged for the conference or the rest of the training cycle. Continuing education credits were again made available for psychologists, social workers and nurses.

The expanded cycle consisted of basically the same one day conference, though pilot phase program graduates were used as part of the conference panel discussions, and the exact same intensive workshops. The additional events were a half day Seminar in Implementing Parent Training Programs in Public Agencies which was to be attended by trainees and administrators from the agencies, and a six day course in Parent Development and Cultural Issues in Child Rearing. The seminar covered such topics as the types of classes that can be taught in agencies, gaining agency support for parenting classes, generating classes, issues in conducting classes, and funding of classes. The Parent Development course offered a comprehensive model of parental functions and responsibilities, a view of parenting as a process of co-development between parents and children, program similarities and differences, issues unique to Black and Hispanic child rearing, child abuse and neglect, and the role of parenting instructors as resource persons in regard to child development information.

The first expanded training cycle was directed at the same types of agency personnel as were the pilot cycles, and the second cycle was to be for personnel who worked in school and in early childhood education settings (nursery schools, Head Start Centers, day care centers, etc.).

The new cycle which was directed primarily at the mental health agencies turned out to be very exciting. By the time of its invited

conference, the sponsoring organization had developed very strong relations with the County Mental Health Department, who had had three of the staff members trained during the pilot test cycles including one social worker who had trained other staff members to deliver parenting services. The department decided to relate to the new training cycle in a comprehensive way and was preparing to have all of its clinics from all of the mental health regions represented at the conference. In addition, other mental health agencies had become more interested in the program because they had heard such good things about it from other program graduates. These developments, along with the more attractive training agreement and the personal invitations to the conference, resulted in such a large request for conference attendance that the conference had to be moved to larger quarters.

The conference attracted 250 persons from 113 different agencies and clinics. The majority of the participants were from mental health agencies, were women, and were social workers, though all core mental health professions were represented. The vast majority of the participants found the entire conference and the presentations and panel discussions to be useful to their day-to-day clinic activities. Each participant received a twelve page document that described the training program events and the schedule of events, and which contained the nomination forms. There were forms for both the person(s) nominated and for the administrator doing the nomination. The administrators had to indicate the types of support which the agency would provide for their nominated staff persons, including a commitment on the agency's part to actually run parenting programs.

It had been announced that only ten persons per parenting approach would be trained (30 training slots for this training cycle), and the program received nearly twice as many nominations as available training slots. Two or three additional persons were accepted into each workshop to better accommodate the large number of applicants and to anticipate some attrition.

The second expanded training cycle which was designed to be directed at early childhood education and school personnel had a

different fate. The conference was scheduled for the summer but it had to be cancelled because very few of the target personnel would be available for a summer conference. Instead, enrollment documents were mailed to all school districts, Head Start programs, nursery schools and other similar educational settings. Not enough of these agencies nominated people to fill the cycle. The main reason that the nursery school and day care centers did not nominate people was that they were basically two or three person operations that could not release anyone during their operating hours, which were the hours of the training events. Possibly scheduling the events in the evenings and on weekends, and having college credits available, would have made the training program more attractive and attendable for these categories of workers. To fill the training cycle, nominations were opened up to mental health and social service agencies. The result was a very heterogeneous mix of trainees in this cycle. There were Head Start Parent Involvement Coordinators who had not completed high school next to psychologists with doctoral degrees. In comparison to the first expanded training cycle where 87% of the trainees had masters or higher degrees, only 59% of the participants in the second expanded cycle had masters or higher degrees. Some persons were allowed in the second cycle who would not be running parenting groups in their agencies but who would be training others to do so.

A more detailed evaluation of the trainees' performance in the intensive workshops of these cycles revealed that more of these trainees were seen by their workshop leaders as better prepared to run parenting groups than those from the pilot phase workshops.

Reactions to the Implementation Seminars, which included agency administrators, were very positive. The seminars seemed to better inform the trainees about the problems and potential solutions to implementation and marketing issues, and created a better understanding of these problems on the part of the administrators. They also stimulated the agencies to do more planning for their first parenting groups. The participants in the seminar of the first expanded cycle provided cogent feedback about the length and methods of the seminar which resulted in changes in the second cycle seminar.

Similar first cycle feedback about the Parent Development Course also resulted in second cycle modifications for this training event also. The vast majority of graduates of the first cycle indicated that they were better prepared to deliver parenting services as a result of being in this course, and more than half actually incorporated ideas and materials from the course into the parenting services that they actually delivered. The graduates of the second expanded cycle had similar positive reactions and also incorporated course ideas and materials into their services.

Follow up assessments six months after the end of the expanded training cycles revealed that, on the average, the graduates of the expanded cycles saw their training as being more sufficient in preparing them as parenting instructors than did the graduates of the two pilot test cycles. The expanded cycle graduates also reported greater support from their agencies: on every dimension of agency support (providing release time, administrative assistance, purchasing training materials, providing child care and transportation for parents, etc.) the expansion graduates received more support, and three to four times as many expansion phase agencies added parent training to their on-going services.

In terms of how the expansion phase graduates used their training, eighty to ninety percent had conducted parenting groups by the time of the six month follow up. This far exceeded the percent of pilot phase graduates who had conducted groups at either the immediate or longitudinal (18 to 24 month) follow up.

Fewer of the expansion phase graduates trained parents on an individual basis and as part of other services. Many more, however, trained others to use the skills and ideas that they had learned in the program. Nearly twice as many expansion phase graduates used their training in this important way than did the graduates of the pilot cycles.

In terms of total number of persons estimated as being impacted through all six uses, the first expansion cycle impacted more than the second expansion cycle. Both cycles, however, impacted more persons over a comparable period of time than were impacted by

either of the pilot phase cycles. Whereas the graduates of the two pilot phase cycles had impacted 4987 and 4009 persons over a comparable period, the expansion phase graduates had impacted 7306 and 6823 persons.

Further evidence of the greater productivity of the expansion phase graduates was the fact that not only did more of these graduates actually conduct parenting groups, but they conducted nearly as many groups in one third to one fourth the amount of time as it took the pilot phase graduates.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results clearly show that the expanded training model, with its new training agreement and additional training events, was superior. The expansion phase graduates were better prepared to be parenting instructors, were better supported by their agencies in conducting parenting services, were more productive in running parenting groups, and used their training to impact greater numbers of persons.

While it is clear that the expanded model is superior and that it leads to a wider dissemination of positive parenting ideas and skills, the results should not be interpreted to mean that the graduates do not need further education. They were trained in the basics of running the particular parenting programs but there is much more to be learned about how to conduct these programs, particularly how to conduct them with parent populations for whom they were not designed. In terms of implementation and marketing, there are more strategies that need to be explored, especially in terms of generating groups from among high risk and hard to reach parents and in terms of attracting groups that can pay for the services. Indeed, two organizations that have proprietary interests in the parenting programs (the Effectiveness Training organization that created P.E.T. and the American Guidance Service that distributes the STEP program) spend a good deal of time helping experienced instructors with implementation and marketing. One implication of these reservations is to provide advanced and on-going training for program graduates,

and to keep them linked to proprietary organizations and other organizations that are supportive of parent training.

In terms of replicating the training model, the current document, with its descriptions of all training events, its report on how best to conduct the model and its extensive appendix of training documents and evaluation procedures, provides a blueprint for how other program operators or sponsoring agencies can go about conducting the program in their areas of the country. In short, the training model is available and ready to be replicated.

Organizations that seem appropriate for sponsoring the replication are state health, mental health, social service educational and alcohol and drug abuse agencies. Each type of agency can find an appropriate rationale for conducting such a program and for training workers within its service system to deliver the parent training services. For example, a drug abuse agency can appeal to the fact that one of the known contributors to adolescent drug abuse are family problems and ineffective parent-child communication (Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, 1983). By training large numbers of workers to conduct parenting classes and insuring that a large number of classes are taught, the drug abuse agency could make a strong case that it has mounted a major drug abuse prevention campaign because it has impacted one of the major contributors. Similar rationales are available for other agencies, as discordant family relations and ineffective parenting has been implicated in a wide variety of social and educational problems.

Whatever agency does the sponsoring, it seems wise that the agency be seen as a legitimate and/or established provider of continuing education services for the training population.

In terms of funding support for program replication, the above rationale should also have some appeal to state legislatures who could allocate state funds for program replication. The same appeal could be made to private foundations for funding support. Another data-based rationale to public and private funding sources could be that large numbers of individuals are impacted through the training of a small cadre of instructors. The data on the six types of

training uses is impressive and should be positively understood by funding sources who want to stretch every ounce of impact out of available dollars. In short, the training program gives a "big bang for the buck."

The exact nature of a crucial aspect of the "bang," the effectiveness of the parent training services, needs much more attention. While there has been research to indicate that the standard parenting programs have positive impacts on many of the parents and children involved, there is much more that needs to be learned. Particularly, there is need for comparative studies on which programs work best with which parent-child groups and there needs to be greater specificity of the characteristics of the parents and children who benefit or do not benefit from the different kinds of programs. Also badly needed are research studies that specify the exact disorders and problems, or precursors of disorders and problems, which the parenting programs are aimed at preventing. These studies would have to be longitudinal in nature, which makes them rather costly, but they could yield information that could take parent training out of its current status as an "idea whose time has arrived" into the status of an intervention that has been shown to have demonstrable effects on preventing costly human and social problems. Such demonstrated effects could serve as a powerful rationale for broad-base funding for parent training and, out of necessity, for similar funding for training parenting instructors.

Another possibility in terms of program replication is to incorporate the training model into already existing programs for training human service personnel. It certainly seems possible that a social work department or school, or psychology department or professional school, could create a degree specialty in parent training or parent development and utilize the training technology of this model program. Their students could run parenting groups as part of their field placement or internship experiences. Graduates of these departments or schools would possess relatively unique skills which might increase their employability.

Another replication possibility, which is being explored by CICC, is to offer the training in smaller units. Rather than mount the

entire program (conference, intensive workshops, implementation seminar, parent development course), offer it to a potential training population in smaller parts. For example, do a showcase conference and poll the participants for which of the three workshops they prefer, and which of the other training events they need (the implementation seminar and/or various parts of the parent development course). Then just make the most preferred workshop and the necessary parts available.

There are, of course, other ways of utilizing the knowledge and training technology that has emerged from the development of this national training model. It remains for creative legislatures, communities, professional groups and program operators to make full use of this multi-faceted and highly successful training model.

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, R. and Liberman, R. Evaluating Groups for Training Parents in Child Management. Paper presented at the eighty-first annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1973.
- Aitchison, R. Confident Parenting Workshop Leader's Guide. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, 1976.
- Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration Prevention Plus: Involving Schools, Parents and the Community in Alcohol and Drug Education. DHHS Publication No. (ADM) 83-1256, 1983.
- Alvy, K.T. Preventing Child Abuse. American Psychologist, 1975, Vol. 30, No. 9, 921-928.
- Alvy, K.T. Parent Training and a National Model for Training Professionals as Parent Trainers. In Parent Training Approaches, 1977, Audio Cassette Series, Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, Studio City, California.
- Alvy, K.T. The Enhancement of Parenting: An Analysis of Parent Training Programs. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, Inc., September 1981(a).
- Alvy, K.T. Effective Black Parenting: A Review and Synthesis of Black Perspectives. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, November 1981(b).
- Alvy, K.T., Fuentes, E.G., Harrison, Deborah S., and Rosen, L.D. The Culturally-Adapted Parent Training Project: Original Grant Proposal and First Progress Report. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, July 1980.
- Alvy, K.T., Harrison, Deborah S., Rosen, L.D. and Fuentes, E.G. Black Parenting: An Empirical Study with Implications for Parent Trainers. Studio City, California, July 1982.
- Alvy, K.T., Harrison, Deborah S., Rosen, L.D., and Fuentes, E.G. Black Parent Training Programs. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, Inc., November 1982.
- Alvy, K.T. and Rubin, H.S. Personnel for Parent Development: Conceptual Framework and Preliminary Results of Pilot Phase Training Cycles. Studio City, California: Center for the Improvement of Child Caring, Inc., October 1979.

- Alvy, K.T. and Rubin, H.S. Parent Training and the Training of Parent Trainers. Journal of Community Psychology, 1981, 9, 53-66
- Arnold, E.L.(ED). Helping Parents Help Their Children. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1978.
- Auerbach, A. Parents Learn Through Discussion. New York: John Wiley Company, 1967.
- Becker, W. Parents are Teachers: A Child Management Program. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1971.
- Bigner, J.J. Parent-Child Relations: An Introduction to Parenting. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979.
- Bry, A. TA for Families. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Carkhuff, R. and Bierman, R. Training as a Preferred Mode of Treatment of Parents of Emotionally Disturbed Children. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, Vol. 17, No. 2, 157-161.
- Child Abuse and Neglect: An Overview of the Problem (Vol. 1, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Publication No. (OHD) 75-30073). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. (a)
- Child Abuse and Neglect: The Roles and Responsibilities of Professionals (Vol. 2, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Publication No. (OHD) 75-30074). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. (b)
- Child Abuse and Neglect: The Community Team: An Approach to Case Management and Prevention (Vol. 3, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Publication No. (OHD) 75-30075). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. (c)
- Cobb, D.E. and Medway, F.J. Deteminants of Effectiveness in Parent Consultation. Journal of Community Psychology, 1978, 6, 229-240.
- Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco, California: W.H. Freeman and Co., 1967.
- Corsini, R. and Painter, G. The Practical Parent: ABC's of Child Discipline. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Diagram Group Child's Body: A Parent's Manual. New York: Wallaby Book Published by Simon and Schuster, 1977.
- Dinkmeyer, D. and McKay, G. Systematic Training for Effective Parenting: Parent's Workbook. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, 1976.

- Dreikurs, R. Children: The Challenge. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1964.
- Dreikurs, R. and Gray, L. Logical Consequences: A New Approach to Discipline. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1968.
- Education Commission of the States. Education for Parenthood: A Primary Prevention Strategy for Child Abuse and Neglect (Child Abuse Project: Report No. 93). Denver, Colorado, 1976.
- Eimers, R. and Aitchison, R. Effective Parents/Responsible Children: A Guide to Confident Parenting. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.
- Ellis, A. and Grieger, R. Handbook of Rationale-Emotive Therapy. New York: Springer, 1977.
- Fontana, V. Somewhere a Child is Crying: Maltreatment Causes and Prevention. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- Gil, D. Violence Against Children: Physical Abuse in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Gordon, T. Parent Effectiveness Training. New York: Wyden, 1970.
- Gordon, T. Parent Effectiveness Training. New York: New American Library, 1975.
- Gordon, T. P.E.T. in Action: Inside P.E.T. Families. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Guerney, B.F., Jr. Filial Therapy: Description and Rationale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 29, 304-310.
- Helfer, R. and Kempe, H. (Eds.). The Battered Child (2nd ed.) Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Helfer, R. and Kempe, H. Child Abuse and Neglect: The Family and the Community. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1976.
- James, M. Transactional Analysis for Moms and Dads. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- James, M. Techniques in Transactional Analysis. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- Justice, B. and Justice, R. The Abusing Family. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1976.

- Martin, B. Child-Parent Relations. In Horowitz, F. (Ed.) Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 4. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Martin, H. (Ed.) The Abused Child: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Developmental Issues and Treatment. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.
- Mental Health of Children: Services, Research and Manpower. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Miller, W. Systematic Parent Training: Procedures, Cases and Issues. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1975.
- Mitre Corporation in collaboration with the Mental Health Service Development Branch, National Institute of Mental Health. Challenge for Children's Mental Health Services. McLean, VA: Mitre Corporation, 1977.
- Patterson, G. Families: Applications of Social Learning to Family Life. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1971.
- Patterson, G. Professional Guide for Families and Living with Children. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1975.
- Patterson, G. Living with Children: New Methods for Parents and Teachers. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1976.
- President's Commission on Mental Health. Report to the President (4 Vols.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Sparling, J. and Lewis, Isabelle Information Needs of Parents of Young Children. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Frank Porter Child Development Center, 1980.
- Tavormina, J. B. Evaluation and comparative studies of parent education. In R.R. Abidin, (Ed.), Parent Education and Intervention Handbook. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1980.

APPENDIX

1. Document for 1980 Training Cycle
2. Document for 1981 Training Cycle
3. Invitation to 1980 Parenting Conference
4. Conference Evaluation Forms
5. Training Agreement Document
6. Workshop Follow-Up Interview
7. Examination for Confident Parenting Workshop
8. Examination for STEP-Adlerian Workshop
9. Examination for PET Workshop
10. Trainer Evaluation of Workshop Participants
11. Document for Implementation Seminar
12. Plan for Generating and Maintaining Parenting Classes
13. Implementation Seminar Evaluation Form
14. Family Developemnt Chart
15. Parent Development Course Individual Session Evaluation Form
16. Parent Developemnt Course Take-Home Exam

THE PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

	Page
I. Overview	1
II. Training Events	2
1. Outline of Events	2
2. Parent Training Approaches Conference	3
3. Parent Training Approaches Workshops	4
4. Implementation Seminar	5
5. Parent Development Course	5
III. Nomination Issues and Procedure	6
IV. Selection Issues, Criteria and Procedures	8
V. Nomination Forms	10

I. Overview

The Personnel for Parent Development Program is a national model for training human service professionals and paraprofessionals to deliver parent training services. The program is supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, and it has trained over 80 persons from 60 different mental health, social service and educational agencies.

The 1980 training cycle is being offered free of charge and continuing education credits and certificates are available. This cycle consists of four training events which are spaced over a period of eight months:

- (1) A one day invited conference to showcase different parent training approaches,
- (2) Intensive workshops in these approaches,
- (3) A seminar in Implementing and Maintaining Parent Training Services in Public Agencies, and
- (4) A course in Parent Development.

Only agencies which are represented at the conference are eligible to nominate staff to take the workshops, seminar and course. A total of 30 persons will be selected (10 per workshop).

The 1980 training cycle is primarily for mental health agencies (county mental health clinics, community mental health centers, child guidance clinics, psychiatric clinics, etc.) and for agencies that run child abuse treatment and prevention programs.

II. Training Events

1. Outline of 1980 Training Cycle

Parent Training Approaches Conference
July 18, 1980 8:30 a.m. - 4:45 p.m.
Ambassador Hotel



Nomination and Selection Process
1. Agencies mail nomination forms to CICC by August 8, 1980.
2. Agencies informed of persons selected by August 31, 1980.



Orientation Meeting of All 30 Trainees
September 17, 1980 7:30 p.m.-9:30 p.m.
Thalians Community Mental Health Center,
Auditorium



Adlerian Workshop
Tuesdays 2:00-4:30 p.m.
Sept. 23, 30; Oct. 7, 14,
21, 28; Nov. 4, 18; Dec.
16; Jan. 13
CICC

Confident Parenting Workshop
Thursdays:
Sept. 25 9:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
Oct. 2 9:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
Oct. 16 9:30 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
Nov. 6 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Dec. 4 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
CICC

P.E.T. Workshop
Friday, Oct. 3
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Saturday, Oct. 4
9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Fridays:
Oct. 10 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Oct. 17 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Oct. 24 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Dec. 5 9:00 a.m.-12 Noon
Jan. 9 9:00 a.m.-12 Noon
CICC



Implementation Seminar
For all 30 trainees and agency administrators
November 14, 1980 8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Thalians Community Mental Health Center,
Auditorium



Parent Development Course
For all 30 trainees
Wednesdays 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Nov. 26; Dec. 3, 10, 17, 24, 31; Jan. 7, 14,
21, 28; Feb. 4, 11
Location: To be arranged

2. PARENT TRAINING APPROACHES CONFERENCE: AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

When: Friday July 18, 1980, 8:30 a.m. - 4:45 p.m.
Where: Ambassador Hotel, Boulevard Room
3400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California

The purpose of this invited conference is to inform mental health and child guidance agencies in Southern California about different approaches to training parents, and to provide them with a basis for choosing which approaches they might want their staffs trained to deliver.

Authorities in three major approaches will present, discuss and illustrate them. They will also form a panel to explore similarities and differences. During the panel discussion, they will be joined by persons who were previously trained in these approaches and who are currently using them in local agencies.

Agency board members and advisory council persons, and agency heads and staff members are welcome at the conference.

PROGRAM

MORNING

- 8:30 Check in/Pick up Conference Packets
- 9:00 Overview of Parent Training, Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D.
- 9:15 The Adlerian Approach - using Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, Richard Royal Kopp, Ph.D.
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 The Social Learning Approach - using Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training, Julie Menzies Kuehnelt, Ph.D.
- 12:00 Lunch

AFTERNOON

- 1:15 The Parent Effectiveness Training Approach, Thomas Gordon, Ph.D.
- 2:30 Break
- 2:45 Panel Discussion: Drs. Kopp, Kuehnelt and Gordon, plus professionals who are currently training parents in these approaches. Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D., Moderator
- 4:15 Evaluation of Conference
- 4:45 Adjourn

3. PARENT TRAINING APPROACHES WORKSHOPS

The Parent Effectiveness Training Approach Participants will learn the skills to teach the 8 week PET course, which has been taken by over 250,000 parents nationwide. PET helps parents raise responsible children by teaching them therapeutic communication skills and non-authoritarian methods for solving conflicts with their children. Trainer modeling, role playing, lectures, discussion, tape recordings and peer teaching methods will be used.

Trainer: Kathleen Cornelius, National Trainer
Effectiveness Training, Inc.

Dates and Times: Friday October 3 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Saturday October 4 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Friday October 10 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Friday October 17 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Friday October 24 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Friday December 5 9:00 a.m. - 12 Noon
Friday January 9 9:00 a.m. - 12 Noon

Location: CICC, 11331 Ventura Blvd., Suite 103, Studio City, California

The Adlerian Approach Participants will learn the skills to lead a 9 session Adlerian parenting course entitled Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP). This approach is based on a democratic philosophy concerning the family rights of children and parents. It teaches parents to understand the "misbehaviors" of children and promotes the use of logical and natural consequences as a method of discipline. The workshop will be conducted in such a manner that the leader and the participants will rotate roles.

Trainer: Dr. Richard Royal Kopp
California School of Professional Psychology

Dates and Times: Tuesdays 2:00 - 4:30 p.m.
September 23, 30; October 7, 14, 21, 28; November 4, 18; December 16 and January 13, 1981

Location: CICC

Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training Participants will learn to conduct a 10 session Confident Parenting course which is based on social learning principles. This course has been experimentally and clinically validated by use with over 500 parents of diverse ethnic backgrounds in community mental health centers nationwide. The workshop emphasizes teaching parents how to praise more effectively and frequently, to create a positive climate in the home, and teaches effective limit setting and discipline techniques. Trainer modeling, role playing, and individually-designed assignments will be used.

Trainer: Dr. Julie Menzies Kuehnel
Center for the Improvement of Child Caring

Dates and Times: Thursdays
September 25 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
October 2 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
October 16 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
November 6 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
December 4 9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Location: CICC

4. IMPLEMENTATION SEMINAR

Seminar in Implementing and Maintaining Parent Training Services

This seminar is for the 30 persons who are being trained to deliver the services and an administrator or community relations person from their agencies. The purpose is to provide information, materials and strategies on how to implement and maintain parent training groups within agencies. Topics such as the following will be explored: the role of agency administration, support staff and volunteers, media publicity, recruitment and selection of parents, location and times for groups, orientation meetings and incentives for attendance, support services such as transportation and child care, graduation ceremonies and certificates, and sources of funding.

Instructor: Dr. Kerby T. Alvy
Center for the Improvement of Child Caring

Dates and Times: November 14, 1980 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Location: Thaliens Community Mental Health Center
Auditorium, Plaza Level, C-101
8730 Alden Drive
Los Angeles, California 90048

5. PARENT DEVELOPMENT COURSE

Parent Development Course This 12 week course provides the 30 persons in training with a developmental-ecological framework for understanding parental functioning, and recent information about child development and cultural differences in child rearing. The child development information will be discussed within the context of the kinds of questions that parents ask and how best to supply the information they need. The class sessions on cultural differences will focus on Black and Hispanic child rearing patterns and issues, and how to use these in conducting parent training. The course will utilize recent readings and research in the area of child-parent relations, and recently collected data from program graduates and hundreds of local parents.

Instructor: Dr. Kerby T. Alvy
Center for the Improvement of Child Caring

Dates and Times: Wednesdays 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
November 26, December 3, 10, 17, 24, 31
January 8, 14, 21, 28, 1981
February 4, 11, 1981

Location: To be arranged

III. Nomination Issues and Procedure

Agency Responsibilities An agency may nominate one or more staff members if the agency is prepared to:

- (1) Release the staff member to attend all training events (the parent training approach workshop, the implementation seminar, and the parent development course).
- (2) Assign an administrator or community relations person to participate in the implementation seminar.
- (3) Support the staff member in conducting parent training groups under the auspices of the agency. This may require that the agency provide clerical or volunteer help to assist the staff member in implementing groups in or through the agency, and it may require publicizing the groups within and outside the agency to generate parent participation. It definitely requires that the agency purchase the necessary training materials for the parents in the groups. These costs are \$10 per parent in the Adlerian and Confident Parenting groups, and \$25 per parent in the P.E.T. groups.

Staff Member Responsibilities A staff member who is nominated must be prepared to:

- (1) Attend and participate in all training events.
- (2) Complete all evaluation tasks for each training event. This includes filling out forms to evaluate each event, taking content and process exams, and being available for telephone follow-up interviews.
- (3) Conduct parent training groups in or through the nominating agency. A minimum of two parent training groups for 15 parents each (or three groups of 10 parents) must be conducted or started before June 1981.

Nomination Procedure An agency nominates a staff member by completing the attached Nomination Forms and returning them to CICC. The nominated staff person and an agency administrator must sign the forms and they must be returned to CICC by August 8, 1980.

IV. Selection Issues, Criteria and Procedures

To gain some perspective on the selection criteria and procedures and to guide you in nominating the most appropriate staff persons, it may be helpful to have more information about the program's focus and history.

The Personnel for Parent Development Program is designed to train agency staff persons to conduct specific kinds of parent training groups. These groups are basically courses. They differ from parent rap groups or group therapy in that they teach a definite set of child rearing ideas and skills through a definite training methodology. Each session of each course has its own objectives, curriculum and methods. Each course has undergone extensive field testing with a variety of parent populations.

CICC and NIMH want to insure that the program will provide the staff persons with sufficient training to prepare them to conduct these courses. The program's track record in this regard has been good. Even when the program consisted of only the workshops, most of the persons who were trained were assessed as being sufficiently prepared to conduct the courses. Feedback from these persons indicated, however, that they could have benefited from additional training in related areas, and that is why we added the course in Parent Development to this cycle.

We also want to insure that the persons who are trained will actually conduct the courses in their agencies. Not all of the persons who were previously trained did this. Reasons why they didn't had to do with (a) our not preparing them well enough to deal with the issues and problems of implementation, and (b) their agencies not being very supportive. We have modified the program in response to these problems. We have made the entire program free of charge to make it more attractive to agencies, and we have created a seminar to better assist the staff persons and their agencies in implementing the courses.

We also want to insure that minority group staff persons participate in the program. Of the 80 previously trained persons, 6 were of Black, Hispanic or Asian background. We want to maintain or increase this level of minority participation in this cycle.

Finally, we want to train staff persons who are most likely to enjoy and be successful at implementing groups and training parents. We have some data and impressions from previous training cycles which suggest some of the characteristics of successful participants. Demographic and educational data did not offer much help in suggesting these characteristics. For example, neither profession, educational level, gender or whether or not someone was a parent were predictors of successful participation. The person's attitude regarding the importance of parent training in helping families was a significant predictor. Persons who strongly believed that parent training was an important intervention to help children and who believed that parents could change through educational means were the most successful.

It was also our impression that the most successful persons possessed what might be called an entrepreneurial attitude in that they were challenged by the problems of implementing groups, they engaged in creative means of implementing, and they rarely were put off by resistance and problems. These successful persons also seemed to have a bit of the ham in them. They seemed to enjoy the spotlight that comes with being a group leader and they frequently used humor in conducting their groups.

Selection Criteria The selection of the 30 trainees will be based on both agency and staff member considerations.

An agency that has thought out its participation in the program and that can make a definite commitment to supporting staff in conducting the courses under its auspices is in the best position to have its staff members selected.

In thinking through its participation, an agency should not only consider the previously mentioned support issues (release time, assigning an administrator to the implementation seminar, purchasing the parents' materials) but also such related issues as the agency's and staff member's access to parents. Which parents will be in the groups? Will they be parents of children who are agency clients and/or parents whose children are not clients? Will they be recruited from the broader community? Will the courses be offered to all new clients as a means of screening parents into or out of other agency services? These issues have to do with whether the agency conceives of the courses as primary and/or secondary prevention services, and the agency's outlook in regard to prevention.

Also to be considered is whether the agency intends to make these courses a part of their regular community services, and what funds it has available and/or can generate to do this. Does the agency plan to charge clients for the courses? Does it intend to get re-imbursed through a third party arrangement?

While many agencies have already dealt with issues like these, other agencies may just be starting to deal with them. Having a staff member selected does not require having these issues resolved. It does require a willingness to resolve them, and CICC is prepared to work with the agencies in resolving them.

In regard to staff member considerations, a staff person who possesses the previously mentioned attitudinal and style characteristics is more likely to be selected. The profession of the staff person will not be a major consideration, nor whether the staff person is a parent. As has been indicated, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses, educators and paraprofessionals,

whether or not they are parents, seem to do as well in the program. It is possible that the staff member's role in the agency may be more important than profession or education, in that the role may (a) require similar attitudes and skills as those involved in implementing and conducting courses, and (b) put the staff person into contact with large enough numbers of parents so that constituting parent training courses is easier.

In addition to these considerations, preference will be given to mental health agencies and to agencies who run child abuse treatment and prevention programs. If these types of agencies do not nominate sufficient numbers of qualified persons, nominated persons from other types of agencies will be considered.

Selection Procedures Agency administrators and nominated staff persons need to complete and return the Nomination Forms by August 8, 1980. If there are any questions about the forms or about nominating appropriate staff, agencies may want to consult with the training program director, Dr. Kerby T. Alvy, and they are encouraged to call (213-980-0903).

The selection of the 30 persons will occur between August 8 and August 31, 1980. During that time the training program may want to obtain more information and to speak with the administrators and staff persons. By August 31 the agencies will be informed of the selections.

THE PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

V. NOMINATION FORM

Part I To be completed by Nominated Staff Person.

A. Parent Training Workshop Preference

(Rank your preference from 1 to 3 with 1 being Most Preferred)

- ___ Adlerian - Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP)
___ Parent Effectiveness Training (PET)
___ Social Learning - Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training

B. General Information

Name _____ Sex: M ___ F ___

Home Address _____ Zip _____

Telephone(s) Day _____ Evening _____

Age at last birthday _____ Marital Status: Married _____

Ethnic Background _____ Separated ___ Divorced ___

Widowed ___ Never Married ___

Do you have children? Yes ___ No ___ If so, how many? _____

How many years have you worked as a human service provider? _____ years

C. Job at Nominating Agency

1. Job Title or Position _____

2. Department _____

3. Paid Hours Worked Per Week at agency _____

Total Hours Worked Per Week at agency _____

4. Job Duties at Agency (be specific) _____

5. Client Populations Served (be specific) _____

6. Do you currently train or educate parents as part of your regular job responsibilities at this agency? ____ Yes ____ No
If yes, please check whenever applicable in describing the nature of your parenting services:

- As part of home visits _____
As part of counseling or psychotherapy sessions _____
Parent Conferences (for school personnel) _____
Rap or discussion groups for parents _____
Lead a formal parenting program which has a _____
session-by-session curriculum, parent's _____
manual, etc. _____
a) Parent Effectiveness Training _____
b) Social Learning/Behavioral _____
(specify: _____)
c) Adlerian - STEP _____
(specify: _____)
d) Reality Therapy Approach _____
e) Other (be specific _____)

If checking these options does not adequately represent the parenting services that you deliver at this agency, please describe them here: _____

7. Do you currently or have you ever taught parenting courses at colleges, adult schools or other agencies? ____ Yes ____ No
If yes, please describe these and indicate where they were taught: _____

D. Education and Training

1. Highest Degree Earned. Check One:

M.D. _____ Ph.D. _____ Ed.D. _____ Other Doctorate _____
M.S.W. _____ Other Masters _____ B.A. or B.S. _____
Nursing Diploma (2 or 3 year program) _____ A.A. _____
High School _____ Other: _____
Where did you obtain this degree? _____
Year Completed: _____ Major: _____ Minor: _____

2. Licenses and Credentials Obtained. Check where applicable:

Medical _____ R.N. _____ Education (admin.) _____
Psychology _____ M.F.C.C. _____ Other (please specify: _____)
A.C.S.W. _____ Teaching _____
L.C.S.W. _____ None _____

3. Have you ever taken training (course work, practica, research, conference workshop, etc.) to be a parent educator or trainer?

Yes _____ No _____ Where? _____ When? _____

Please describe the training: _____

4. As a parent or prospective parent, have you ever received specialized parent education or parent training?

Yes _____ No _____ Please check where appropriate or applicable:

PET _____ Behavioral/Social Learning
STEP-Adlerian _____ Approach _____
Transactional Analysis Approach _____ Rational Emotive Approach _____
Child Study Assn. Method _____ Other. Please specify: _____

Where did you receive this training? _____

When did you complete this training? _____

5. Have you attended a CICC Parent Training Conference?

1977 _____ 1978 _____ 1980 _____ 1981 _____ Have Not Attended _____

E. Open Ended Questions

1. Why do you want to enroll in the Personnel for Parent Development program? _____

2. You will be required to run parent training classes at or through the nominating agency if you are selected. Where will these parents be recruited from? _____

3. In regard to the workshop which you indicated as being most preferred, why did you choose this particular workshop?

F. Rated Questions

Instructions for Using the Following Rating Scale: (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

The - end of the scale reflects negative feelings, attitudes and low quantity of importance. The + end of the scale reflects positive feelings, attitudes and high quantity of importance. The number 3 reflects a neutral feeling, attitude or quantity of importance.

1. How important are parent training or parent education skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
2. How important are family psychotherapy skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
3. How important are individual psychotherapy skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
4. How important are couples or marital counseling skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
5. Should parent education or parent training skills be required for your current position(s)? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

G. Verification

Signature of Nominated Person

Date

Return this form to CICC
11331 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 103
Studio City, California 91604

THE PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

V. NOMINATION FORM

Part II To be completed by Agency Administrator

A. General Information

Name _____

Title/Position at Agency _____

Agency Name _____

Address _____ Zip _____

Phone(s) _____

B. Name(s) of Nominated Staff Person(s)

C. Our agency is prepared to support this (these) person(s) in participating in the Personnel for Parent Development Program by:
(indicate yes or no)

1. _____ Providing release time to attend all training events.
2. _____ Providing or arranging for clerical or volunteer assistance to help the staff person(s) generate and conduct parent training groups.
3. _____ Providing or arranging for appropriate space in which the groups will be conducted.
4. _____ Providing or arranging for child care for parents in the groups.
5. _____ Providing or arranging for transportation for parents in the groups.
6. _____ Purchasing the training materials for parents in the groups, or
_____ Charging parents for the materials.
7. _____ Publicizing the groups inside and outside of agency.
8. _____ Assigning an administrator or public relations person to participate in the Implementation Seminar (Name and title of such person if known at this time _____)
9. _____ Insuring that at least two groups of 15 parents or three groups of 10 parents receive training from each staff person selected by June 31, 1981.

D. Verification

Signature of Administrator

Date

Return this form to:
CICC
11331 Ventura Blvd.
Suite 103
Studio City, Ca. 91604

FREE INSTRUCTION IN PARENT TRAINING
THROUGH THE
PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
1981 TRAINING CYCLE

	Page
I. Overview	1
II. Outline of 1981 Training Cycle	3
III. The Parent Training Programs	4
IV. Intensive Workshops	4
V. Implementation Seminar	5
VI. Parent Development Course	6
VII. Nomination Issues and Procedure	6
VIII. Selection Issues, Criteria and Procedures	7
IX. Certificates and Credits	9
X. Nomination Forms	10
XI. Flyers on Parent Training Courses	

* * * * *

I. Overview

Parent training is considered to be the number one community service to promote the healthy emotional development of children and to prevent child abuse.

The Center for the Improvement of Child Caring (CICC), a non-profit community service, training and research organization, has been delivering parent training services in Southern California for nearly a decade. CICC has also been training persons from other organizations to deliver these services.

CICC trains parent training instructors through a carefully organized program called Personnel for Parent Development. This program is a national model and is supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Three training cycles of this program have already been completed, and over 100 persons from 80 different agencies in Southern California have been trained. These persons, who are primarily psychologists and social workers from mental health and child guidance agencies, are now delivering parent training services to thousands of parents. The

majority of parents who these persons are now training have children who are considered to be emotionally disturbed or abused.

The 1981 training cycle is primarily for persons who work in educational and child care organizations. The reasons for focusing this cycle on persons who work in these organizations are threefold: (1) they probably know the parents' children better, (2) they have easier access to groups of parents, and (3) they are in a position to offer parents these highly-valued services either before their children are disturbed or abused or very early in a disturbed or abusive parent-child situation.

The following types of organizations are eligible to nominate persons for this cycle: preschools, childrens' centers, day care centers, Head Start agencies, public and private schools, and family-oriented social and educational groups. A total of 30 persons will be chosen and this training cycle will be offered free of charge.

The program consists of three training experiences which are spaced over a period of five months:

(1) Intensive Workshops (10 trainees per workshop) to learn how to conduct one of three types of parent training programs: Parent Effectiveness Training (P.E.T.), Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (S.T.E.P.), and Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training,

(2) A Seminar in Implementing Parent Training Programs in Child Care and Education Agencies (all 30 trainees plus an administrator from their organization),

(3) A course in Parent Development and Cultural Aspects of Child Rearing (all 30 trainees).

The remainder of this document provides the basic information, requirements, dates and forms for nominating persons for the 1981 training cycle.

II. Training Events

1. Outline of 1980 Training Cycle

Nomination and Selection Process

1. Agencies/schools turn nomination forms into CICC by September 1, 1981.
2. Agencies/schools informed of persons selected by September 18, 1981.

Orientation Meeting for all 30 Trainees

September 30, 1981 7:30 - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Coast Federal Savings, Sherman Oaks

Adlerian-STEP Workshop

Wednesdays

9:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon

Oct. 7, 14, 21, 28,

Nov. 4, 18, 25, Dec. 2

9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Jan. 6, 27

Location: CICC, Studio City

Confident Parenting Workshop

Mondays

9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Oct. 5, 19,

Nov. 2

9:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Nov. 30,

Jan. 4

Location: CICC, Studio City

P.E.T. Workshop

Thursday Oct. 15 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Fridays

9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Oct. 16, 23, 30 and Nov. 6

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon

Dec. 4, Jan. 8

Location: CICC, Studio City

Implementation Seminar

For all 30 trainees and an agency/school administrator

Wednesday November 11 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Location: Coast Federal Savings, Sherman Oaks

Parent Development Course

For all 30 trainees

Thursdays 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Dec. 10, 17, Jan. 7, 14, 21, 28

Location: Coast Federal Savings, Sherman Oaks

III. The Parent Training Programs

Persons nominated must choose one of the three parent training programs to learn, and it is this program which they are expected to conduct with parents from their agencies or schools.

Each program has undergone extensive field-testing and is effective in teaching parents skills and ideas that are very helpful in rearing children.

Each program is usually taught to small groups of parents (10-15 per group). The groups usually meet for two to three hours a week for eight to ten weeks. The parents read a manual which supplements each of the weekly training sessions. The parents' manuals for the P.E.T. and Confident Parenting programs are available in English and Spanish, but the S.T.E.P. parents' manual is only available in English.

Each program can also be taught to smaller groups or to one parent at a time. While best results are achieved by teaching the entire program, specific ideas and skills from each program can be taught without having to teach the entire program. The actual ways that the ideas and skills are taught greatly depends on the instructor's opportunities for offering the programs and the parents' ability to attend.

Flyers or brochures are used to inform parents about the programs. A flyer for each program is attached, and provides additional information on which to base a decision of which program to learn. If further information or consultation on this decision is needed, please feel free to call the CICC and ask to speak with either Mr. Efrain Fuentes or Drs. Deborah Harrison, Larry Rosen or Kerby Alvy (213-980-0903).

IV. Intensive Workshops

Each workshop is designed to provide participants with the information, skills and materials to conduct standard parent training programs in their agencies or schools. Each workshop is organized into three phases: an intensive learning phase where participants are exposed to the entire program, a break-from-training phase when participants are expected to begin their own programs, and a follow-up phase where participants receive supervision from the workshop leaders about the programs they have begun.

The Parent Effectiveness Training Program Workshop. This workshop is led by Ms. Kathleen Cornelius who is a national trainer with Effectiveness Training, Inc. Ms. Cornelius will use a variety of instructional methods in teaching participants to teach the standard 8 session P.E.T. program. These include trainer modeling, role playing, lectures, discussion, tape recordings and peer teaching methods.

Participants receive the Instructor's Manual and Resource book, and the Parents' Workbook.

Dates and Times: Thursday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. October 15
Fridays 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. October 16,
23, 30, and November 6
Fridays 9:00 a.m. -12:00 Noon December 4,
and January 8

Location: CICC, 11331 Ventura Blvd., Suite 103
Studio City, California

The Systematic Training for Effective Parenting Program Workshop.
This program is based on ideas from Adlerian Psychology and the workshop will be led by Dr. Richard Royal Kopp of the California School of Professional Psychology. Dr. Kopp will conduct the workshop in such a manner that he and the participants will alternate workshop leadership roles as the participants are taught to conduct the standard 9 session STEP course. Participants receive the complete STEP Instructor's Kit with audio-cassettes, posters, and parents' handbook.

Dates and Times: Wednesdays 9:30 a.m. -12:00 Noon October 7,
14, 21, 28, November 4, 18, 25,
December 2
9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. January 6
and 27

Location: CICC

The Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training Program Workshop.
This workshop is led by Dr. Julie Kuehnel of the Center for the Improvement of Child Caring. Dr. Kuehnel will use a variety of teaching methods including trainer modeling, films, role playing, and individually-designed projects to prepare participants to teach the standard 10 session Confident Parenting program. This workshop provides a variety of opportunities to rehearse the entire program before teaching it, and participants receive the Instructor's Manual and Parents' textbook.

Dates and Times: Mondays 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. October 5, 19
and November 2
9:30 a.m. -12:30 p.m. November 30
and January 4

Location: CICC

V. Implementation Seminar

This one-day seminar takes place toward the end of the workshop's intensive learning phase. It is designed to provide participants and their agencies/schools with materials, information and strategies for developing, conducting and maintaining parent training programs. It is expected that whenever possible the agency/school will also send an administrator or public relations person to the seminar.

Dr. Kerby Alvy, CICC's Director, will lead the seminar. Topics to be covered are: the role of agency/school administration, support staff and volunteers in conducting successful programs; media publicity; recruitment and selection of parents; location and scheduling of programs; meetings and incentives for attendance; the need for such support services as transportation and child care; graduation ceremonies and certificates; and sources of funding support.

Dates and Times: Wednesday 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. November 11

Location: Conference Room, Coast Federal Savings
14651 Ventura Blvd., Sherman Oaks

VI. Parent Development Course

This six-day course offers a framework for appreciating child growth and development within the context of parent and family growth and development. It reviews the types of child development information that parents usually require. It explores the differences and similarities in child rearing practices and attitudes among White, Black and Mexican parents. It provides coverage of child abuse and neglect.

The information and materials from this course can be directly incorporated into the standard parent training programs; it can be used to extend the programs; and/or it can be used to create other programs. The course broadens the instructor's role to include that of resource person in regard to child development, and it sensitizes instructors to cross cultural, legal and ethical issues in conducting parent training programs.

Participants need to purchase the text books for this course. Dr. Alvy is the course leader.

Dates and Times: Thursdays 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. December 10, 17
January 7, 14, 21, 28

Location: Conference Room, Coast Federal Savings
14651 Ventura Blvd., Sherman Oaks

VII. Nomination Issues and Procedure

Agency/School Responsibilities. An agency/school may nominate one or more staff members or directors to the program if it is prepared to:

(1) Release the nominated person(s) to attend all training activities (the workshop, seminar and course).

(2) Assign an administrator or public relations person to also participate in the Implementation Seminar.

(3) Support the nominated person(s) in conducting parent training programs in the agency/school. Support may include a variety of activities: providing clerical or volunteer help

to assist the nominated person in running the programs, publicizing the programs, providing space for the programs, providing child care or transportation for the parents, etc.

Support definitely requires that the agency/school be responsible for purchasing the materials that will be needed for the parents who will take the programs. An agency/school can purchase the materials themselves or can have the parents buy them. The materials cost approximately \$10 per parent which includes handling charges and tax.

It is hoped that a nominating agency/school can meet all of these responsibilities, and it is recognized that some will not be able to do this. Since this training cycle is directed toward different kinds of organizations than previous cycles, CICC is not sure what is reasonable to expect. Therefore, we encourage agencies/schools to nominate people even if it will be unable to meet some of the responsibilities.

Nominated Person's Responsibilities. A person who is nominated must be prepared to:

- (1) Attend and participate in all training events.
- (2) Complete all evaluation tasks for each training event. This includes filling out forms to evaluate each event, taking examinations to assess what is learned, and being available for telephone follow-up interviews.
- (3) Conduct parent training programs in or through the nominating agency or school. A goal to strive for is to complete or start at least two programs for 15 parents each (or three programs for 10 parents each) by June 1982.

Nomination Procedure. An agency/school nominates a staff member by completing the attached nomination forms and returning them to the CICC. There is one form for the nominated person and one form for the nominating agency/school. Both forms must be completed and signed. In cases where the nominated person is also the agency director, both forms still need to be completed. Nominations forms must be mailed or turned in to CICC no later than September 1, 1981.

VIII. Selection Issues, Criteria and Procedures

CICC wants to select persons who will be successful at generating and conducting parent training programs. Our experiences in training mental health personnel indicates that success is a joint product of the characteristics of the instructor and the degree and types of agency support.

Successful instructors tend to possess an intreprenurial attitude in that they are challenged by the problems of implementing parenting programs, they engage in creative means of

implementation, and they are rarely put off by agency and parental reluctance. These successful instructors also have fine senses of humor which they employ in generating and conducting classes. They also seem to have a bit of the ham in them as they enjoy the spotlight that comes with being a group leader. Foremost, they have a strong belief that parents can be helped through educational means.

Agency support seems to be a function of having administrators who really believe in parent training and who perceive parent training services as furthering the humanitarian and financial goals of the agency. Agency administrators with this outlook also appear to be able to nominate more persons with the "successful instructor characteristics" mentioned above.

Because the vast majority of previously trained instructors had graduate degrees, it is hard for us to estimate the value of previous educational attainment. We realize that many of the persons who work in the organizational settings that this cycle is directed toward will not have graduate degrees. Hence, we are not setting graduate educational status as a requirement. Indeed, we are prepared to select some persons with limited formal education, provided that those persons have excelled in some related activity (such as a child care worker or parent).

Because of the ethnic plurality of the Southern California area, and because personal knowledge of ethnic heritage and life style is important in training parents from different cultures, we are also interested in selecting visibly ethnic instructors (Blacks, Latinos, Asians, and native Americans). These visible ethnic persons make up about 50% of the local population and we hope to select approximately that number for this training cycle.

Selection Criteria. The selection of the 30 trainees will be based on the agency and personal characteristics that have just been mentioned.

An agency or school that has thought through its participation in the program and that can make clear commitments to supporting the nominated person(s) in conducting parent training programs under its auspices is in the best position to have its persons selected.

In thinking through its participation, an agency/school should not only consider the previously mentioned support and personal issues but also which parents will be recruited for the actual programs. It is generally expected that the agency/school has access to at least 30 parents who the nominated person could train by June 1982. These could be parents of the children who are enrolled in the agency/school program or parents whose children are not enrolled. The main issue is clarity over which parents will receive the programs that the nominated person is required to deliver.

As has been indicated, the 1981 training cycle is directed toward educational and child care organizations. Our recruitment efforts have been targeted at these groups. Because we do not know what the response will be from these groups, we are leaving open the possibility of selecting persons from other types of organizations. Hopefully, the response from education and child care will provide an ample pool of candidates.

Selection Procedure. Agency/School administrators and nominated persons need to complete and return the Nomination Forms by September 1, 1981. If there are any questions about the forms or the nomination processes, you are welcome to consult with any of the training program staff (Mr. Fuentes, Dr. Harrison, Dr. Rosen or Dr. Alvy: 213-980-0903).

The selection of the 30 trainees will occur between September 1 and September 18, 1981. During that time we may want to obtain additional information or speak directly to the administrator and nominated persons. Everyone will be informed by or on September 18 of the actual selections.

The 30 persons who are selected will be expected to attend a special orientation session on Wednesday night September 30, 1981.

IX. Certificates and Credits

Upon completion of all the training program activities, the trainees will receive a certificate as a Parent Training Instructor.

The certificate will indicate the number of training hours completed, and can be used as verification of continuing education credits. CICC is an acknowledged continuing education provider for psychologists and nurses. It also provides credits for social work personnel.

CICC is prepared to work out individual arrangements for persons who need college credit for the training. Persons wanting such credits are alerted to the possibility of having to pay a per unit fee to the college with whom an arrangement is established.

THE PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

X. NOMINATION FORM

Part I To be completed by Nominated Person.

A. Parent Training Workshop Preference

(Rank your preference from 1 to 3 with 1 being Most Preferred)

- _____ Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP)
_____ Parent Effectiveness Training (PET)
_____ Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training

B. General Information

Name _____ Sex: M _____ F _____

Home Address _____ Zip _____

Telephone(s) Day _____ Evening _____

Age at last birthday _____ Marital Status: Married _____

Ethnic Background _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____

Widowed _____ Never Married _____

Do you have children? Yes _____ No _____ If so, how many? _____

How many years have you worked as an educator or human service
provider? _____ years

C. Job at Nominating Agency/School

1. Job Title or Position _____

2. Department _____

3. Paid Hours Worked Per Week _____
Total Hours Worked Per Week _____

4. Job Duties (be specific) _____

5. Client Populations Served (be specific) _____

6. Do you currently train or educate parents as part of your regular job responsibilities with this organization? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please check whenever applicable in describing the nature of your parenting services:

As part of home visits _____

As part of counseling or psychotherapy sessions _____

Parent Conferences _____

Rap or discussion groups for parents _____

Lead a formal parenting program which has a session-by-session curriculum, parent's manual, etc. _____

a) Parent Effectiveness Training _____

b) Social Learning/Behavioral _____

(specify: _____)

c) Adlerian - STEP _____

(specify: _____)

d) Reality Therapy Approach _____

e) Other (be specific _____)

If checking these options does not adequately represent the parenting services that you deliver at this organization, please describe them here: _____

7. Do you currently or have you ever taught parenting courses at colleges, adult schools or other agencies? _____ Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please describe these and indicate where they were taught: _____

D. Education and Training

1. Highest Degree Earned. Check One:

M.D. _____ Ph.D. _____ Ed.D. _____ Other Doctorate _____
M.S.W. _____ Other Masters _____ B.A. or B.S. _____
Nursing Diploma (2 or 3 year program) _____ A.A. _____
High School _____ Other: _____
Where did you obtain this degree: _____
Year Completed: _____ Major: _____ Minor: _____

2. Licenses and Credentials Obtained. Check where applicable:

Medical _____ R.N. _____ Education (admin.) _____
Psychology _____ M.F.C.C. _____ Other (please specify: _____)
A.C.S.W. _____ Teaching _____ None _____
L.C.S.W. _____

3. Have you ever taken training (course work, practica, research, conference workshop, etc.) to be a parent educator or trainer?

Yes _____ No _____ Where? _____ When? _____

Please describe the training: _____

4. As a parent or prospective parent, have you ever received specialized parent education or parent training?

Yes _____ No _____ Please check where appropriate or applicable:

PET _____ Behavioral/Social Learning Approach _____
STEP-Adlerian _____ Rational Emotive Approach _____
Transactional Analysis Approach _____ Other Please specify: _____
Child Study Assn. Method _____

Where did you receive this training? _____

When did you complete this training? _____

5. Have you attended a CICC Parent Training Conference?

1977 _____ 1978 _____ 1980 _____ Have Not Attended _____

E. Open Ended Questions

1. Why do you want to enroll in the Personnel for Parent Development program? _____

2. You will be required to run parent training classes at or through the nominating organization if you are selected. Where will these parents be recruited from? _____

3. In regard to the workshop which you indicated as being most preferred, why did you choose this particular workshop?

F. Rated Questions

Instructions for Using the Following Rating Scale: (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

The - end of the scale reflects negative feelings, attitudes and low quantity of importance. The + end of the scale reflects positive feelings, attitudes and high quantity of importance. The number 3 reflects a neutral feeling, attitude or quantity of importance.

1. How important are parent training or parent education skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
2. How important are family psychotherapy skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
3. How important are individual psychotherapy skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
4. How important are couples or marital counseling skills related to your work? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
5. Should parent education or parent training skills be required for your current position(s)? (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

G. Verification

Signature of Nominated Person

Date

Return this form to CICC
11331 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 103
Studio City, California 91604

THE PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

X. NOMINATION FORM

Part II To be completed by Agency/School Administrator

A. General Information

Name _____

Title or Position _____

Agency/School Name _____

Address _____ Zip _____

Phone(s) _____

B. Name(s) of Nominated Person(s)

C. Our agency/school is prepared to support this (these) person(s) in participating in the Personnel for Parent Development Program by: (indicate yes or no)

1. _____ Providing release time to attend all training events.
2. _____ Providing or arranging for clerical or volunteer assistance to help the person(s) generate and conduct parent training groups.
3. _____ Providing or arranging for appropriate space in which the groups will be conducted.
4. _____ Providing or arranging for child care for parents in the groups.
5. _____ Providing or arranging for transportation for parents in the groups.
6. _____ Purchasing the training materials for parents in the groups, or
_____ Charging parents for the materials.
7. _____ Publicizing the groups inside and outside of agency.
8. _____ Assigning an administrator or public relations person to participate in the Implementation Seminar (Name and title of such person if known at this time _____)
9. _____ Insuring that at least two groups of 15 parents or three groups of 10 parents receive training from each person selected by June 31, 1982. If answer here is "No", indicate reasons: _____

-
- This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

Signature of Administrator _____ Date _____

CICC
11331 Ventura Blvd., Suite 103
Studio City, California 91604



The Center for the Improvement of Child Caring
and
The National Institute of Mental Health

Cordially Invite You To Attend
The Third Southern California Conference:

An Ounce of Prevention: Parent Training Approaches

Friday, July 18, 1980
8:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M.

Thelma Community Mental Health Center
Auditorium, Plaza Level, C-101
8730 Alden Drive
Los Angeles, California 90048

Deadline for Reservations:
July 7th, 1980

To reserve a seat, call CICC at
(213) 980-0903, or mail enrollment form

PROGRAM

Morning

- 8:30 Check in/Pick up Conference Packet
- 9:00 Overview of Parent Training, Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D.
- 9:15 **The Adlerian Approach** — using Systematic Training for Effective Parenting,
Richard Royal Kopp, Ph.D.
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 **The Social Learning Approach** — using Confident Parenting: Survival Skill
Training, Julie Menzies Kuehnle, Ph.D.
- 12:00 Lunch

Afternoon

- 1:15 **The Parent Effectiveness Training Approach**, Thomas Gordon, Ph.D.
- 2:30 Break
- 2:45 **Panel Discussion**: Drs. Kopp, Kuehnle and Gordon, Kerby T. Alvy, Ph.D.,
Moderator
- 4:15 Evaluation of Conference
- 4:45 Adjourn

PARENT TRAINING IS A CRITICAL SERVICE

Parent training is the number one service to promote the healthy development of children.

— National Institute of Mental Health

Effective parenting is crucial to prevent ordinary child behavior problems from becoming serious personality and learning disorders. Poorly managed child behavior problems can turn into serious instances of child abuse.

— Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children

Whatever therapy parents have received, it is incomplete if the treatment has not dealt with the role of the adult as a parent.

— The Abused Child, Drs. Martin and Beezley

Parent training is clearly the most pivotal service for both preventing and treating childhood disorders and child abuse.

This one day conference will showcase three major parent training approaches:

THE PARENT EFFECTIVENESS TRAINING APPROACH

THE ADLERIAN APPROACH

THE SOCIAL LEARNING APPROACH

Each approach will be presented by its creator or by a nationally recognized authority. Toward the end of the conference, the presenters will form a panel and interact with the audience to discuss critical issues in parent training. They will be joined by professionals who are currently delivering the approaches in local agencies.

Agencies represented at the conference are eligible to nominate staff persons to receive specialized training to learn the approaches free of charge. The specialized training consists of intensive workshops in each approach, a seminar in implementing parent training services within agencies, and a course in Parent Development.

CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD CARING

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

This conference is one part of a larger continuing education program run by CICC through a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The National Institute requires that the conference be evaluated in terms of clarifying the backgrounds and characteristics of the persons attending the conference and their reactions to the conference.

Information from the conference participants will be treated as confidential. Please complete questionnaire and give it to the CICC staff before leaving the conference. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Name: _____ Sex: M ____ F ____

Home Address: _____

Telephone: Day _ _ _ - _ _ _ _ Evening _ _ _ - _ _ _ _

Age as of last birthday ____ Marital Status: Married ____ Separated ____
Divorced ____ Widowed ____
Never Married ____

Do you have children? Yes ____ No ____ If so, how many? ____

Do you have grandchildren? Yes ____ No ____ If so, how many? ____

Name of agency where you work: _____

Address: _____

Current position or title: _____

Check space which is most applicable to your current position:

Full Time ____ Part Time ____ Consultant ____ Volunteer ____
Intern ____

Does your agency provide "release time" for continuing education?
Yes ____ No ____

Does your agency provide "funds" for continuing education?
Yes ____ No ____

Does your agency provide "in-service" training for staff development?
Yes ____ No ____

II. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1) Highest Degree Earned. Check one:

M.D. _____ Ph.D. _____ Ed.D. _____ Other Doctorate _____
M.S.W. _____ Other Masters _____ B.A. or B.S. _____
Nursing Diploma (2 or 3 year program) _____ A.A. _____
High School _____ Other: _____
Where did you obtain this degree? _____
Year Completed: _____ Major: _____ Minor: _____

2) Licenses and Credentials Obtained. Check where applicable:

Medical _____ R.N. _____ Education (admin.) _____
Psychology _____ M.F.C.C. _____ Other (please specify): _____
A.C.S.W. _____ Teaching _____
L.C.S.W. _____ None: _____

3) Have you ever taken training (course work, practica, research, conference workshop, etc.) to be a parent educator or trainer? Yes _____ No _____ Where? _____ When? _____

Please describe the training: _____

4) As a parent or prospective parent, have you ever received specialized parent education or parent training? Yes _____ No _____ Please check where appropriate or applicable:

PET _____	Behavioral/Social Learning
STEP-Adlerian _____	Approach _____
Transactional Analysis Approach _____	Rational Emotive Approach _____
Child Study Assn. Method _____	Other. Please specify: _____

Where did you receive this training? _____

When did you complete this training? _____

III. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: DELIVERY OF HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH, SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

- 1) How many years have you worked as a human service provider? _____
- 2) Do you currently deliver clinical services in a private practice setting? Yes _____ No _____ Approximately how many clients? _____ hours? _____ each week?
- 3) Do you currently deliver clinical services as part of your regular agency responsibilities? Yes _____ No _____ Approximately how many clients? _____ hours? _____ each week?

III. 4) Do you currently train or educate parents as part of your regular job responsibilities? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please check whenever applicable in describing the nature of your parenting services:

As part of home visits _____
As part of counseling or psychotherapy sessions _____
Parent Conferences (for school personnel) _____
Rap or discussion groups for parents _____
Teach a course at college, university, adult school _____
Lead a formal parenting program with parents' manuals, books, etc.:
a) Parent Effectiveness Training _____
b) Behavioral/Social Learning (specify: _____) _____
c) STEP-Adlerian (please specify: _____) _____
d) Reality Therapy Approach _____
e) Other (be specific): _____

IV. TODAY'S CONFERENCE: WRITTEN EVALUATION

- 1) How did you find out about the conference? _____

- 2) Why did you come to the conference? _____

- 3) What did you experience as being the most useful aspects of the conference?

- 4) What were the strengths of the conference? _____

- 5) What were the weaknesses of the conference? _____

- 6) Did the conference meet your expectations? _____

V. TODAY'S CONFERENCE: RATED EVALUATION

Instructions for Using Rating Scale (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

The - end of the scale reflects negative feelings, attitudes and low quantity. The + end of the scale reflects positive feelings, attitudes and high quantity. The number 3 reflects a neutral feeling, attitude or quantity.

Please circle the number that best reflects your thoughts about today's conference and specific presentations:

1) CLARITY OF INFORMATION PRESENTED

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Practical Parenting: The Adlerian Approach	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

2) AMOUNT LEARNED

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Practical Parenting: The Adlerian Approach	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

3) USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION FOR APPLICATION TO YOUR OWN CLINICAL WORK

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Practical Parenting: The Adlerian Approach	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD CARING

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

This conference is one part of a larger continuing education program run by CICC through a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The National Institute requires that the conference be evaluated by the persons attending the conference.

Information from the conference participants will be treated as confidential. Please complete questionnaire and give it to the CICC staff before leaving the conference. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Name: _____

I. TODAY'S CONFERENCE: WRITTEN EVALUATION

- 1) How did you find out about the conference? _____

- 2) Why did you come to the conference? _____

- 3) What did you experience as being the most useful aspects of the conference?

- 4) What were the strengths of the conference? _____

5) What were the weaknesses of the conference? _____

6) Did the conference meet your expectations? _____

II. TODAY'S CONFERENCE: RATED EVALUATION

Instructions for Using Rating Scale (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

The - end of the scale reflects negative feelings, attitudes and low quantity. The + end of the scale reflects positive feelings, attitudes and high quantity. The number 3 reflects a neutral feeling, attitude or quantity.

Please circle the number that best reflects your thoughts about today's conference and specific presentations:

1) CLARITY OF INFORMATION PRESENTED

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
The Adlerian Approach: S.T.E.P.	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

2) AMOUNT LEARNED

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
The Adlerian Approach: S.T.E.P.	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

3) USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION FOR APPLICATION TO YOUR OWN CLINICAL WORK

Entire Conference	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Parent Effectiveness Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
The Adlerian Approach: S.T.E.P.	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Confident Parenting: Survival Skill Training	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)
Panel Discussion	(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+)

CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CHILD CARING

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

This conference is one part of a larger continuing education program run by CICC through a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The National Institute requires that the conference be evaluated in terms of clarifying the backgrounds and characteristics of the persons attending the conference and their reactions to the conference.

Information from the conference participants will be treated as confidential. Please complete questionnaire and give it to the CICC staff before leaving the conference. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Name: _____ Sex: M ____ F ____

Home Address: _____

Telephone: Day ____ - ____ - ____ Evening ____ - ____ - ____

Age as of last birthday ____ Marital Status: Married ____ Separated ____
Divorced ____ Widowed ____
Never Married ____

Do you have children? Yes ____ No ____ If so, how many? ____

Do you have grandchildren? Yes ____ No ____ If so, how many? ____

Name of agency where you work: _____

Address: _____

Current position or title: _____

Check space which is most applicable to your current position:

Full Time ____ Part Time ____ Consultant ____ Volunteer ____
Intern ____

Does your agency provide "release time" for continuing education?
Yes ____ No ____

Does your agency provide "funds" for continuing education?
Yes ____ No ____

Does your agency provide "in-service" training for staff development?
Yes ____ No ____

III. 4) Do you currently train or educate parents as part of your regular job responsibilities? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, please check whenever applicable in describing the nature of your parenting services:

As part of home visits _____
As part of counseling or psychotherapy sessions _____
Parent Conferences (for school personnel) _____
Rap or discussion groups for parents _____
Teach a course at college, university, adult school _____
Lead a formal parenting program with parents' manuals, books, etc.: _____
a) Parent Effectiveness Training _____
b) Behavioral/Social Learning (specify: _____) _____
c) STEP-Adlerian (please specify: _____) _____
d) Reality Therapy Approach _____
e) Other (be specific): _____

IV. TODAY'S CONFERENCE: WRITTEN EVALUATION

- 1) How did you find out about the conference? _____

- 2) Why did you come to the conference? _____

- 3) What did you experience as being the most useful aspects of the conference?

- 4) What were the strengths of the conference? _____

- 5) What were the weaknesses of the conference? _____

- 6) Did the conference meet your expectations? _____

1981-1982 TRAINING CYCLE FOR
PARENT TRAINING INSTRUCTORS

Welcome to the 1981-1982 CICC Training Cycle! You are joining a cadre of over 100 persons from 80 different agencies in Southern California who CICC has trained to deliver parent training services.

Training Agreement

In return for being accepted into this cycle, you and your agency/school are expected to deliver parent training services. Indeed, the entire cycle is designed to provide you and your agency/school with the information, materials and skills to conduct group parent training services to the parents who you serve.

This cycle is supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). As part of our arrangement with NIMH, there are several requirements and expectations that have to be followed:

1. Utilization of Training The general expectation is that you will deliver the parenting services that this training will qualify you to deliver, and that these services will become part of the on-going services provided at your agency/school. The specific expectation is that before June 1982 you will have conducted or started parent training groups which contain at least 30 parents total.

Unless you have negotiated an agreement with Dr. Alvy regarding using the training for other purposes (training staff, etc.) you and your agency/school must use the training to conduct group parent training services. You are free, of course, to use it for additional purposes, but the delivery of services to parents is the required usage.

2. Attendance You are expected to attend all training events (the Workshop training sessions, the Implementation Seminar, and the Parent Development course). If illness, death in the family etc. make it impossible for you to attend any event or session, you must notify CICC by phone as much in advance as possible. All training events have definite starting times

and you are expected to be in attendance when the event starts.

3. Evaluation Each training event requires you to participate in some type of evaluation. You will be asked to either fill out evaluation forms or take examinations at the end of each training event. In addition, you will be expected to be available for a follow-up telephone interview in late March or early April 1982 to explore the actual usages which you are making of the training and to give us feedback about the training cycle.

4. Certificates and Credits Upon completion of all training events you will receive a certificate as a Parent Training Instructor. Completion means that you have attended the events and you have completed the necessary evaluation activities.

The certificate will indicate the number of training hours completed. Number of hours will be determined by your actual daily attendance and promptness (being late means losing hourly credits), and by your completion of the evaluation activities. If you attend an event but do not complete the evaluation, you will not receive hourly credits.

Your certificate can serve as verification of continuing education credits. CICC is a continuing education provider for psychologists and nurses, and it provides credits for social work personnel. CICC is also prepared to work out individualized arrangements for those who may need other types of credit, including college credit. If college credits are sought, it is the responsibility of the trainee to pay for any unit fees necessary.

5. Costs There are no charges for the workshops, Implementation Seminar and the Parent Development course, and most of the training materials will be provided free of cost.

6. Materials There are two types of materials needed, those for the trainees and those for the parents who they will train:

Trainee Materials. The materials for the workshops will include one instructor's manual and one set of related instructional materials, and one parent's manual and one set of related materials for the parents. These will be provided free. If for any reason the trainee is unable to complete the workshop, these materials must be returned to CICC.

The materials for the Implementation Seminar will be provided free. However, the books that will be needed for the Parent Development course need to be purchased by each trainee: these books cost approximately \$25.

Parent Materials. These consist of promotional posters and/or flyers to attract parents to the groups, and books which parents need for the classes. To simplify the transaction about these materials, a \$10 per parent cost is being charged. This covers CICC's expenses for creating and/or purchasing these materials and for making them conveniently available. It is advised that you purchase these materials from CICC as soon as possible (\$10 x 30 parents = \$300). It is expected that your agency/school will either be the purchaser or it will charge the parents for the materials. In any case, it is strongly advised that these materials be purchased early in the training cycle so that you can begin to attract parents and so that you will have all the necessary materials in house before your groups begin.

In ordering these materials from CICC, you should indicate whether you want the parents' books in english or spanish. The books for P.E.T. are available in spanish; the parent's book for Confident Parenting has been translated and needs to be reproduced; none of the STEP materials are in spanish (though they should be available in spanish by early 1982).

7. Agency/School Support Your agency or school has agreed to support you in various ways so that you can deliver parent training under its auspices. In nominating you for this training cycle, it agreed to release you from regular staff responsibilities to attend all of the training events. It also agreed to have an administrator and/or public relations person attend the Implementation Seminar with you, so that at least one other key person at your agency/school would be familiar with the problems and issues of implementing parent training groups. Your agency/school is also responsible for finding ways to purchase the parents' materials. Some agencies/schools are also prepared to help by lending clerical assistance, child care and transportation for the parents in your groups, etc. It is highly recommended that you gain clarity from your agency/school as to the specifics of its support.

Name of Interviewer _____ Date(s) _____

PERSONNEL FOR PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Parent Training Workshop Follow-Up Interview

Name of Workshop Participant _____ ID# _____

Home Address _____

Telephone: Day _____ Evening _____

Type of Workshop _____ Cycle _____

Interview (circle one): Follow-Up _____ Months since end of workshop.

Re-Follow-Up _____ Months since end of workshop.

General Instructions to Interviewer:

1. Initial greetings.
2. Remind interviewee that there will be two interview sessions, each lasting approximately one hour, and make sure that the participant is available for those periods of time. Mention that breaks may be necessary at some time during the interview.
3. Also remind participant that upon completion of the interview he/she will receive _____
4. Describe the sections in the interview that you will be conducting at this session.

Session A:

Section 1: Background Information (including demographics, education, previous parent training)

Section 2: Agency Support

Section 3: Professional Role Attitudes

Section 4: Services Delivered and Parent Training

Section 5: Other Uses of Training Experiences

Session B:

Section 6: Effectiveness of Parent Training

Section 7: Parents' Informational Needs

Section 8: Trainers' Marketing Needs

Section 9: Need for Additional Training

5. Tell the participant that the information received from this interview is for research purposes only and that strict confidentiality will be maintained.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION (B)

DEMOGRAPHICS:

INSTRUCTIONS:

"To begin with, we'd like to have some information about yourself, so that we can generally describe the group of individuals in your workshop. Again, this information will be reported anonymously by use of a coded identification system."

B- 1__	(B- 1) ID #
B- 2__	(B- 2) Gender: ☐ (0) Male ☐ (1) Female
B- 3__	(B- 3) Age: ☐ (as of last birthday)
B- 4__	(B- 4) Marital status: ☐ (0) Married ☐ (1) Separated ☐ (2) Divorced ☐ (3) Widowed ☐ (4) Never married
B- 5__	(B- 5) Do you have children? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes, how many? (Put number in B- 5)
B- 6__	(B- 6) Do you have child rearing responsibilities in your current living situation? ☐ (0) No ☐ (1) Yes
B- 7__	(B- 7) What is your ethnic group? ☐ (1) Black ☐ (2) Hispanic ☐ (3) White ☐ (4) Asian ☐ (5) Other _____
B- 8__	(B- 8) What languages do you speak besides English? ☐ (0) Spanish ☐ (1) French ☐ (2) German ☐ (3) Other _____ ☐ (4) None
<u>EDUCATION:</u>	
B- 9__	(B- 9) What is your highest degree earned? ☐ (00) Medical ☐ (01) Ph.D. ☐ (02) Ed.D. ☐ (03) Other Doctorate ☐ (04) M.S.W. ☐ (05) M.P.C. ☐ (06) Other Masters ☐ (07) B.A. or B.S. ☐ (08) Nursing (2-3 yrs) ☐ (09) A.A. ☐ (10) High School ☐ (11) Other _____
B-10__	(B-10) License/Credentials obtained (enter main license only) ☐ (0) Medical ☐ (1) Psychology ☐ (2) A.C.S.W. ☐ (3) L.C.S.W. ☐ (4) R.N. ☐ (5) M.P.C.C. ☐ (6) Teaching ☐ (7) Education (Adm) ☐ (8) Other _____ ☐ (9) None

SECTION 1: (cont'd)

PREVIOUS PARENT TRAINING:

- B-11 (B-11) As a professional, had you ever received training to be a parent educator or trainer before the workshop?
(0) No (1) Yes
If yes, where? _____ when? _____
Describe: _____

- B-12 (B-12) As a parent or prospective parent had you ever taken a parent education or parent training program before?
(0) No (1) Yes
If yes, what type of program?
____ P.E.T.
____ S.T.E.P. Adlerian
____ Transactional Analysis Approach
____ Child Study Association Method
____ Behavioral/Social Learning Approach
____ Rational Emotive Approach
____ Other _____
- B-13 (B-13) Did you attend a Parent Training Conference before you took the workshop? _____ No (0)
If yes, which cycle
____ (1) Cycle 1 (1977)
____ (2) Cycle 2 (1978)
____ (3) Cycle 3 (1980)
____ (4) Cycle 4 (1981)

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Sections 2,3 and 4 should be asked for each agency and/or private practice. Write the agency or private practice information in the spaces provided.

INSTRUCTIONS:

"Let's proceed to a series of questions for each agency you have worked for or are working for since the beginning of the workshop in _____, including private practice. These questions have to do with (1) support from each agency, (2) your professional role attitudes, and (3) the types of services you deliver in each agency with special emphasis on the ways that you have used the parent training program in your work.

"What agencies and private work have you been involved with since the beginning of the workshop?"

Name of Agency _____ Dept/Unit _____

Job Title _____ Hours per week _____

Employed from _____ to _____

Name of Agency _____ Dept/Unit _____

Job Title _____ Hours per week _____

Employed from _____ to _____

Name of Agency _____ Dept/Unit _____

Job Title _____ Hours per week _____

Employed from _____ to _____

Name of Agency _____ Dept/Unit _____

Job Title _____ Hours per week _____

Employed from _____ to _____

SECTION 2: AGENCY SUPPORT (A)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"Regarding _____ (agency name),
has this agency?"

- A-1 _____ (A-1) Provided release time for workshop
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-2 _____ (A-2) Provided other forms of compensation (comp. time,
mileage, etc.) for workshop enrollment.
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
If yes, describe _____
- A-3 _____ (A-3) Requested workshop parent training program as topic
of in-service training
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-4 _____ (A-4) Requested other parent training as topic of in-
service training
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-5 _____ (A-5) Added workshop parent training programs to regular
agencies services
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-6 _____ (A-6) Added other parent training programs to regular
services
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-6a _____ (A-6a) Who was charged for the parent training services
(check as many as appropriate)?
_____ Parents themselves (1) _____ Insurance companies
_____ Short-Doyle contract (3) _____ Other contractual
_____ Other (please specify) _____ arrangement (4)
- A-7 _____ (A-7) Purchased parent training materials
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-7a _____ (A-7a) In what manner were these materials purchased?
(Check as many as applicable)
_____ Agency funds (1) _____ Charging parents for
_____ Materials (2)
_____ Both (3) _____ Other (Please specify) _____
- (A-8) Provided following services for parents in parent
training:
- A-8a _____ (A-8a) Child care?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-8b _____ (A-8b) Transportation?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-8c _____ (A-8c) Refreshments?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-9 _____ (A-9) Provided administrative support (clerical, mailing,
etc.) for parent training programs
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-9a _____ (A-9a) Provided public relations and advertising support
(newsletter articles, press releases, etc.)
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)
- A-10 _____ (A-10) Paid people to run parent training groups
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1) _____ NA (2)

SECTION 2: AGENCY SUPPORT (A) cont.

A-11_ (A-11) How much does this agency value parent training as a community service?

Not at all (1)	Very little (2)	Average (3)	Very much (4)	Extreme- ly (5)	NA (6)

A-12_ (A-12) How much support is the agency planning to provide for parent training in the near future?

Not at all (1)	Very Much (2)	Average (3)	Very much (4)	Extreme- ly (5)	NA (6)

SECTION 3: PROFESSIONAL ROLE ATTITUDES (P)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"The next six questions concern the importance or value of various skills in relation to your work at _____ (name of agency). Each question should be answered on a 1 to 5 scale, with

1 indicating 'little importance or value',
5 indicating 'high importance or value', and
3 being a 'neutral' position.

"If the skill is not appropriate for this agency (or private practice) just answer 'not appropriate' (NA)"

- P-1 _ (P-1) How important are individual psychotherapy skills in relation to your work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6
- P-2 _ (P-2) How important are family psychotherapy skills in relation to your work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6
- P-3 _ (P-3) How important are couples or marital therapy in relation to your work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6
- P-4 _ (P-4) How important are parent training skills in relation to your work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6
- P-5 _ (P-5) How important was your workshop parent training program in relation to your work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6
- P-6 _ (P-6) How important do you think it is that parent training skills be required for your type of work at this agency?
(-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) NA=6

SECTION 4: SERVICES DELIVERED (D) AND PARENT TRAINING(T)

INSTRUCTIONS (for Subsection 1 and 2)

Del: "Now I'd like to ask you about the types of direct services, both individual and group, for children (birth through 18 years) and adults, that you have delivered at _____ (agency name).

"I will list the type of service and then ask you how many clients you have seen since _____ (date when parent training workshop began or when person started at this agency).

"I realize that this may be a difficult request. Your best approximation in numbers will be fine. Please take whatever amount of time you need in order to be as accurate as possible.

"How many clients have you seen in

- 1a. Intake interviews with children/adults,
- 1b. Evaluations including diagnostic and assessment evaluations with children/adults
- 1c. Individual psychotherapy or counseling with children/adults,
- 1d. Individual sessions limited to parent training with adults,
- 1e. Social services with children or adults,
- 1f. Other services for individual children or adults,
- 2a. Group psychotherapy or counseling with children/adults,
- 2b. Other services for groups of children/adults.

Trng: (For questions on use of workshop training to train clients)

"As a result of your participation in the _____ parent training workshop, have you trained clients to use any of the ideas and skills from the workshop when you saw them in child/adult _____ (type of services).

Self: (For questions on using workshop training directly with clients)

"Now, I'm going to ask you about another type of use of the workshop skills and ideas. I'm going to ask you about your own use of the workshop ideas and skills in relating directly to clients, as opposed to training them to use the skills themselves.

"In relating directly to the _____ (#) clients that you saw in _____ (type of service), with how many did you yourself use any of the workshop skills or ideas? _____ (repeat for each type of service delivered).

INSTRUCTIONS (for Subsection 3)

"As a result of your participation in the _____ parent training workshop, have you led any parent training groups as part of your work at _____ (agency name) that followed the standard format and curriculum as indicated in the trainer's manual. (If "yes", ask how many groups, and ask for the total number of individuals who participated in these groups).

"Have you led any parent training groups as part of your work at _____ (agency name) that were not of the standard format or curriculum but that incorporated some of the skills or ideas from the training workshop?" (If "yes", ask how many groups, and ask for the total number of individuals who participated in these groups).

SECTION 4: (Instructions cont'd)

(Data on Clients)

"Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about the clients you've worked with at _____ (name of agency).

"What percentage would you estimate receive government assistance? (AFDC, SSI, State Disability, General Relief, Medical).

"In regard to income level, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"In regard to ethnic group, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"In regard to general adjustment level, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"Now I'm going to ask you specifically about the parents who you have trained individually (1d) or in group (3a and 3b).

"What percentage would you estimate receive government assistance?

"In regard to income level, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"In regard to ethnic group, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"In regard to general adjustment level, what % would you estimate are (see coding form)?

"In regard to the parent training groups you have run, how many were:

Client-Service courses?

Community-Service courses?

Client-Service/Community-Service combined?

Other types (please specify)?

(see coding form) (Note to interviewer: Check that answer to T-83 = T-55 + T-57).

SECTION 4: SERVICES DELIVERED (D) AND PARENT TRAINING (T)

D- 1 _____
T- 2 _____
T- 3 _____
D- 4 _____
T- 5 _____
T- 6 _____
D- 7 _____
T- 8 _____
T- 9 _____
D-10 _____
T-11 _____
T-12 _____
D-13 _____
T-14 _____
T-15 _____
D-16 _____
T-17 _____
T-18 _____
D-19 _____
T-20 _____
T-21 _____
D-22 _____
T-23 _____
T-24 _____
D-25 _____
T-26 _____
T-27 _____
D-28 _____
T-29 _____
T-30 _____
D-31 _____
T-32 _____
T-33 _____
D-34 _____
T-35 _____
T-36 _____
D-37 _____
T-38 _____
T-39 _____
D-40 _____
T-41 _____
T-42 _____
D-43 _____
T-44 _____
T-45 _____
D-46 _____
T-47 _____
T-48 _____
D-49 _____
T-50 _____
T-51 _____
D-52 _____
T-53 _____
T-54 _____
T-55 _____
T-56 _____
T-57 _____
T-58 _____

- NOTES: 1. If workshop participant does not deliver a particular type of service, code it as a "0".
2. If a particular category is not applicable to this workshop participant, leave coding blank. For example, if the participant does not deliver a type of service (Del was coded "0") then the coding for both Trng and Self is left blank).

1. Individual	Child			Adult		
	Del	Trng	Self	Del	Trng	Self
a. Intake	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Eval (Incl-Diag/Assess)	7	8	9	10	11	12
c. Psycho Therapy/Counseling	13	14	15	16	17	18
d. Parent Tng	NA 19	NA 20	NA 21	22	23	24
e. Soc. Svcs	25	26	27	28	29	30
f. Other _____	31	32	33	34	35	36

2. Group	Child			Adult			Family		
	Del	Trng	Self	Del	Trng	Self	Del	Trng	Self
a. Psycho Therapy/Counseling	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
b. Other _____	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54

3. Parent Training Groups	# of Groups : # of Parents	
a. Standard	55	56
b. Non-Standard	57	58

SECTION 4: (cont'd)

CLIENT DATA: General Client Population

D-59 ___ Government Assisted (%)
 D-60 ___ 59
 D-61 ___ Income Level (%)
 D-62 ___ 60 Low Income
 D-63 ___ 61 Middle Income
 D-64 ___ 62 Upper Income
 D-65 ___ Ethnic Group (%)
 D-66 ___ 63 Black
 D-67 ___ 64 Hispanic
 D-68 ___ 65 White
 D-69 ___ 66 Asian
 D-70 ___ 67 Other
 ___ Adjustment Level (%)
 ___ 68 Normal
 ___ 69 Mildly Disturbed
 ___ 70 Very Disturbed

CLIENT DATA: Clients Receiving Parent Training

T-71 ___ Government Assisted (%) (Leave blank if not applicable)
 T-72 ___ 71
 T-73 ___ Income Level (%)
 T-74 ___ 72 Lower Income
 T-75 ___ 73 Middle Income
 T-76 ___ 74 Upper Income
 T-77 ___ Ethnic Group (%)
 T-78 ___ 75 Black
 T-79 ___ 76 Hispanic
 T-80 ___ 77 White
 T-81 ___ 78 Asian
 T-82 ___ 79 Other
 ___ Adjustment Level (%)
 ___ 80 Normal
 ___ 81 Mildly Disturbed
 ___ 82 Very Disturbed

TYPES OF PARENT TRAINING GROUPS CONDUCTED:

T-83 ___ 83 Total number of parent training groups
 (should equal the total of T-55 + T-57)

Types of Courses (#)

T-84 ___ 84 Client-Service
 T-85 ___ 85 Community-Service
 T-86 ___ 86 Client-Service/Community-Service combined
 T-87 ___ 87 Other (Please specify) _____

SECTION 5: OTHER USES OF TRAINING EXPERIENCES (O)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"Now, thinking about all of your work in all of your settings, I'd like to know about additional uses you may have made of your workshop experiences, such as the training of others, giving presentations on parent training or any other uses.

"How many persons have you trained to use the _____ skills and ideas: (see coding form, items a, b and c).

"Now I'd like to know how many people in the following categories you have made formal or informal presentations to about parent training (see coding form).

"Now, I'd like to know about how many written presentations, including grant proposals, you have done (see coding form).

"Have you made other uses of the workshop training that we have not mentioned? How many persons were impacted by these uses?"

Training of Others

a. To Train Parents

O- 1 _____ (O- 1) # Trained (if O-1 is "0" leave O-2 through O-4 blank)
O- 2 _____ (O- 2) # Groups run by these persons
O- 3 _____ (O- 3) # Parents in groups
O- 4 _____ (O- 4) # Individual parents trained by these people

b. To Treat Clients

O- 5 _____ (O- 5) # Trained

c. Other Training Uses (Specify)

O- 6 _____ (O- 6) # Trained

Informal and Formal Presentations

O- 7 _____ (O- 7) Agency Staff
O- 8 _____ (O- 8) Other professional audience (convention, workshops, conferences)
O- 9 _____ (O- 9) Lay or community groups
O-10 _____ (O-10) Friends, neighbors
O-11 _____ (O-11) Relatives including spouses and children

Written Presentations including grant proposals

O-12 _____ (O-12) How many? (Describe _____)

Other Uses (Describe _____)

O-13 _____ (O-13) .ersons impacted

SECTION 6: EFFECTIVENESS OF PARENT TRAINING (E)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"In this section, I will be asking you questions about the effectiveness of the parent training(~~you have been doing~~). The reason for these questions is to get some idea about which parents benefit the most and why. The information should be helpful in modifying parent training programs to meet the characteristics and needs of different parents.

"The parents who I will be asking you about should be parents who received all or the majority of a parent training program, either as a member of a group or on a one-to-one basis.

"I'd like you to select the three parents that have benefited the most from the parent training program, and the three parents who benefited the least from the training program. Benefiting the most means two things: (1) you believe that they have learned the parenting skills very well, and (2) they reported that they were using the skills with their children and that they were very helpful.

"Benefiting the least means two things: (1) you believe that they did not learn the parenting skills, and (2) they reported that the skills were not helpful."

SECTION 6: EFFECTIVENESS OF PARENT TRAINING (E)

		Parents Who Benefited MOST		
	PARENTS' CHARACTERISTICS	First	Second	Third
E-1				
E-2				
E-3	Sex (0=male, 1=female)	1	2	3
E-4	Age	4	5	6
E-5				
E-6	Education (0=up to 8th grade, 1=some high school, 2=high school degree, 3=college, 4=college degree, 5=unknown)	7	8	9
E-7				
E-8	Ethnic Group (1=Black, 2=Hispanic, 3=White, 4=Asian, 5=Other, 6=unknown)	10	11	12
E-9				
E-10	Religion (0=Protestant, 1=Catholic, 2=Jewish, 3=Other, 4=unknown)	13	14	15
E-11				
E-12	Government Assistance (0=No, 1=Yes, 2=unknown)	16	17	18
E-13				
E-14	Income Level (0=low, 1=middle, 2=high, 3=unknown)	19	20	21
E-15				
E-16	Adjustment Level (0=normal, 1=mildly disturbed, 2=very disturbed, 3=unknown)	22	23	24
E-17				
E-18	Reported child behavior problems (0=none, 1=some, 2=many, 3=very many, 4=unknown)	25	26	27
E-19				
E-20				
E-21				
E-22	CHILDREN'S CHARACTERISTICS (if unknown, leave blank)			
E-23				
E-24	Number of children	28	29	30
E-25	Number of boys	31	32	33
E-26	Number of girls	34	35	36
E-27				
E-28	Number of preschool	37	38	39
E-29				
E-30	Number of elementary	40	41	42
E-31	Number of Jr/Sr high school	43	44	45
E-32				
E-33	MARITAL CHARACTERISTICS			
E-34				
E-35	Single parent (0=No, 1=Yes)	46	47	48
E-36				
E-37	Marital conflict (0=No, 1=low conflict, 2=high conflict, 3=single, not applicable, 4=unknown)	49	50	51
E-38				
E-39	PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS			
E-40				
E-41	Type of training (0=standard group, 1=non-standard group, 2=individual delivery, 3=unknown)	52	53	54
E-42				
E-43	NARRATIVE			
E-44	Why do you think that this person benefited so much from the training?			
E-45	First parent			
E-46				
E-47				
E-48	Second parent			
E-49				
E-50				
E-51	Third parent			
E-52				

SECTION 6: EFFECTIVENESS OF PARENT TRAINING (E)

		Parents Who Benefited LEAST		
		First	Second	Third
E-1				
E-2				
E-3	<u>PARENTS' CHARACTERISTICS</u>			
E-4	Sex (0=male, 1=female)	1	2	3
E-5				
E-6	Age	4	5	6
E-7	Education (0=up to 8th grade, 1=some high school, 2=high school degree, 3=college, 4=college degree, 5=unknown)	7	8	9
E-8				
E-9	Ethnic Group (1=Black, 2=Hispanic, 3=White, 4=Asian, 5=Other, 6=unknown)	10	11	12
E-10				
E-11	Religion (0=Protestant, 1=Catholic, 2=Jewish, 3=Other, 4=unknown)	13	14	15
E-12				
E-13	Government Assistance (0=No, 1=Yes, 2=unknown)	16	17	18
E-14				
E-15	Income Level (0=low, 1=middle, 2=high, 3=unknown)	19	20	21
E-16				
E-17	Adjustment Level (0=normal, 1=mildly disturbed, 2=very disturbed, 3=unknown)	22	23	24
E-18				
E-19				
E-20	Reported child behavior problems (0=none, 1=some, 2=many, 3=very many, 4=unknown)	25	26	27
E-21				
E-22	<u>CHILDREN'S CHARACTERISTICS</u> (If unknown, leave blank)			
E-23				
E-24	Number of children	28	29	30
E-25	Number of boys	31	32	33
E-26	Number of girls	34	35	36
E-27				
E-28	Number of preschool	37	38	39
E-29	Number of elementary	40	41	42
E-30	Number of Jr/Sr high school	43	44	45
E-31				
E-32	<u>MARITAL CHARACTERISTICS</u>			
E-33				
E-34	Single parent (0=No, 1=Yes)	46	47	48
E-35				
E-36	Marital conflict (0=No, 1=low conflict, 2=high conflict, 3=single, not applicable, 4=unknown)	49	50	51
E-37				
E-38	<u>PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS</u>			
E-39				
E-40	Type of training (0=standard group, 1=non-standard group, 2=individual delivery, 3=unknown)	52	53	54
E-41				
E-42	<u>NARRATIVE</u>			
E-43				
E-44	Why do you think that this person benefited so little from the training?			
E-45	First parent _____			
E-46	_____			
E-47	Second parent _____			
E-48	_____			
E-49	_____			
E-50	Third parent _____			
E-51	_____			
E-52	_____			

SECTION 7: Parents' Informational Needs (I)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"In the following section, I will be asking you about the needs for child development information which you may have noticed in the parents you have trained.

"Specifically I will ask you about nine areas of potential child development information:

- (1) Physical Health and Sickness
- (2) Practical Day-To-Day Activities
- (3) General Information About Child Growth and Development
- (4) Social Relations in the Home and Community
- (5) Children with Special Physical and Emotional Problems
- (6) Community Resources
- (7) Child Abuse and Neglect
- (8) Black Child Rearing
- (9) Mexican-American Child Rearing

I-1 Physical Health and Sickness

"Have any parents who you have trained needed information about their children's physical health and sickness such as information about how the body works, how to detect diseases, how to deliver simple first aid?" If yes, "How many?"

_____ Many _____ Few _____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower _____ Middle/Upper _____ Preschool _____ Elem. Sch. _____ Jr./Sr. High _____

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-2 Practical Day-To-Day Activities

"Have any parents who you have trained needed information about such practical activities as toilet training, crying, diapering, bathing, feeding, weaning or playing with children?" If yes, "How many?"

_____ Many _____ Few _____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower _____ Middle/Upper _____ Preschool _____ Elem. School _____ Jr./Sr. High _____

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-3 General Child Development

"Have any parents who you have trained needed information about heredity, birthing, or children's motor, cognitive or social abilities at different ages? If yes, "How many?"

____ Many ____ Few ____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower Middle/Upper Preschool Elem. Sch. Jr./Sr. High

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-4 Social Relations in Home and Community

"Have any parents who you have trained needed information about such matters as preparing children for new siblings, explaining or understanding death and sexual issues, or understanding and dealing with such institutions as the school?" If yes, "How many?"

____ Many ____ Few ____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower Middle/Upper Preschool Elem. Sch. Jr./Sr. High

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-5 Children with Special Problems

"Have any parents who you have trained needed information about children's anxieties or fears, bedwetting, behavior problems, or about physically, visually or hearing handicapped children?" If yes, "How many?"

____ Many ____ Few ____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower Middle/Upper Preschool Elem. Sch. Jr./Sr. High

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-6 Community Resources

Have any parents who you have trained needed information about such community resources as babysitting, day care, housing, employment, health care, legal aide, or education? If yes, "How many?"

____ Many ____ Few ____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

What kinds of parents have asked these questions?

Social Class of Parents _____ Age of Children _____

Lower Middle/Upper Preschool Elem. Sch. Jr./Sr. High

Other pertinent characteristics offered by trainer _____

I-7 Child Abuse and Neglect

Have any parents who you have trained needed information about Child Abuse and Neglect? If yes, "How many?"

____ Many ____ Few ____ None

What have they specifically needed to know? _____

SECTION 7: Parents' Informational Needs (I) cont.

I-10 Did you incorporate any of the ideas or materials from the Parent Development course into your parent training classes or services
 _____ No _____ Yes (If so, what ideas or materials?) _____

I-11 On a 1 to 5 scale where 5 is "Very Helpful" and 1 is "Not Helpful At All" how helpful was the Parent Development course in preparing you to address parents' questions concerning:

a. Child and Parent Development	5	4	3	2	1
b. Cultural Differences in Black Child Rearing	5	4	3	2	1
c. Cultural Differences in Mexican-American Child Rearing	5	4	3	2	1
d. Child Abuse and Neglect	5	4	3	2	1
e. The Five-part Model of Parenting	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION 8: TRAINERS' MARKETING NEEDS (M)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"In the following section, I will be asking you questions about implementing and maintaining parent training programs. From all facets of the parent training program (workshop, Implementation Seminar, Parent Development course) did you receive sufficient information and/or training:

- M- 1 (M- 1) On how to give parent training presentations to your agency staff?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 2 (M- 2) To help approach your supervisor about starting a parent training group?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 3 (M- 3) To help you negotiate with your supervisor on starting a parent training group?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 4 (M- 4) To help obtain in-house referrals for parent training?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 5 (M- 5) To help obtain referrals for parent training from other agencies?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 6 (M- 6) To help you advertise, publicize and promote your parent training groups?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 7 (M- 7) To help you generate interest for your parent training groups in the lay community?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 8 (M- 8) To help you generate interest for your parent training groups in the agency community (outside of your own agency)?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M- 9 (M- 9) To help you maintain attendance in a parent training group?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M-10 (M-10) To help you extend a parent training group beyond the standard course?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M-11 (M-11) To help you use the information, materials and other resources from CICC?
_____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
- M-12 (M-12) Is there any additional information or training on implementing or maintaining parent training groups that you would have needed? _____ No (0) _____ Yes (1)
If yes, what? _____

SECTION 9: NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TRAINING (N)

INSTRUCTIONS:

"Finally, in this last section, we will be asking you some questions about your own workshop training.

"Now that substantial time has elapsed since your training program ended, we would like to know if the program provided you with sufficient preparation to be an effective parent trainer. On a 1 to 5 scale, please indicate how sufficient your preparation was, with "1" indicating insufficient and "5" indicating Sufficient.

- N1__ (N1) 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one)
- "If more training were available to you, would you be interested in:
- N2__ (N2) A repeat of the workshop in your particular approach
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N3__ (N3) More detailed examination of the workshop material (history, theory)?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N4__ (N4) An advanced workshop in the same approach?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N5__ (N5) A workshop in a different parent training approach?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N6__ (N6) More information or education in child development for parent trainers?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N7__ (N7) More information or education on marketing and implementing parent training?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____
- N8__ (N8) More information or education on cultural differences in child rearing?
____ No(0) ____ Yes(1) If yes, comment _____

Confident Parenting Instructor Workshop

Concept and Procedure Mastery Examination

Name _____ Date _____

The purpose of this exam is to evaluate your understanding of the workshop materials and procedures. If a disparity is evident between your personal opinion or preference and the answer that is correct according to the Workshop Leader's Manual, please answer in favor of the information in the Leader's Manual.

1. Which of the following clients would be appropriate referrals for group parent training?
 - a.) Mr. and Mrs. Tom Mix, whose child, Marty, has been in trouble at school for beating up other kids.
 - b.) Mr. and Mrs. Charles Chaplin whose son, seems destined to fail at every task he undertakes; no social skills, failing in school, etc. He causes no grief to Mr. and Mrs. Chaplin, but they would like to help him succeed.
 - c.) Mr. Gene Autrey, his only son, Pat, seems quite "spacy" since his parents divorce. He exhibits multiple problems and he doesn't appear to be "in contact with the real world".
 - d.) Doris Day wants help for her retarded daughter, although her husband Rock refuses to have anything to do with psychologists, etc.
2. According to the Leader's Guide, the goal of the workshop is:
 - a.) For parents to be able to dominate their children's lives.
 - b.) To develop effective child management skills in parents.
 - c.) To relieve the therapist from dealing with trivial cases on a one-to-one basis.

3. Which of the following fulfill the Leader's Guide definition for a "target behavior"?
 - a.) Number of times Mary takes responsibility.
 - b.) Number of times Bob wets his bed.
 - c.) Number of minutes of cooperative play (sharing) between Larry and significant others.
 - d.) Number of times Debbie doesn't do her homework.
 - e.) Amount of affection shown by Tim during each day.
4. Which of the following is not true?
 - a.) Most behavior is learned.
 - b.) Most parents can specify a wide variety of inappropriate behavior their children engage in.
 - c.) Reinforcement comes after a behavior.
 - d.) Punishment comes after a behavior.
 - e.) Reinforcement sometimes can come before a behavior.
5. Which of the following would unequivocally be a positive behavior consequence for a particular child?
 - a.) Praise from her parent.
 - b.) A "special treat" like candy or ice cream.
 - c.) Talking with friends.
 - d.) None of these.
6. The best way to teach a parent how to use praise and attention is?
 - a.) Just remind them to do it - they already know how.
 - b.) Give a brief lecture covering the most important behavior components and illustrate with many examples.
 - c.) Use lecture, role-playing, and feedback.
 - d.) Use role-playing alone - feedback may embarrass the parents.

7. List the 7 most important components of parental praise.
- 1.)
 - 2.)
 - 3.)
 - 4.)
 - 5.)
 - 6.)
 - 7.)
8. Which of the following procedures is used most often in the family intervention which parents learn in the parent workshop?
- a.) Time-out
 - b.) Mild social punishment
 - c.) Praise
 - d.) Special incentive systems
 - e.) Ignoring
 - f.) Over-correction
9. Which of the following are the three most common problems parents bring to the parent workshop?
- a.) Shyness
 - b.) Fighting
 - c.) Temper tantrums
 - d.) Nail biting and bed-wetting
 - e.) Disobedience; non-compliance

10. According to Leader's Guide, it is important to have parents start their intervention by using positive reinforcement because?
- a.) It is easier to practice than other techniques.
 - b.) It produces a general improvement in the emotional climate at home; parents feel good using it.
 - c.) It works faster than other techniques.
 - d.) It forces parents to see the good behaviors their children have.
11. Which of these are not components of ignoring?
- a.) Look away.
 - b.) Negative facial expression.
 - c.) Ignore verbalization.
 - d.) Ignore immediately.
12. In using special incentive systems, it is important that leaders train parents in both:
- a.) How to choose rewards without having to ask the child.
 - b.) How to fade out special rewards.
 - c.) How to include fines in the system.
 - d.) How to reach most behavior problems at once.
13. The first step in assisting a parent to change a child's behavior is to:
- a.) Teach the parent a new behavior.
 - b.) Help him/her identify which behaviors he/she wishes to eliminate and which behaviors he/she wishes to strengthen in the child.
 - c.) Discuss at length the problems the child's behavior is causing him/her.
 - d.) Extinguish or suppress undesirable behavior.

14. When a parent occasionally disrupts a group therapy session by making wisecracks which alternative is the best to handle him/her?
- a.) Point out his/her weakness to the group.
 - b.) Ask him/her to leave the group.
 - c.) Ignore his/her behavior.
 - d.) Tell him/her to keep quite.
15. Which is the most effective method for a parent to use to eliminate a new, inappropriate behavior on the part of his/her child?
- a.) Extinguish other responses.
 - b.) Have parents ignore his/her undesirable behavior.
 - c.) Punish him/her each time he/she responds incorrectly.
 - d.) Reinforce similar responses.
16. A continuous reinforcement schedule would be used in the behavior change process when:
- a.) A new behavior is being shaped.
 - b.) A new behavior is being maintained.
 - c.) Undesirable behavior is being extinguished.
 - d.) Behavior is being suppressed.
17. When a child is learning a new desirable behavior, he/she will learn it most quickly if he/she is reinforced:
- a.) Occasionally (randomly).
 - b.) Frequently.
 - c.) At regular intervals.
 - d.) Each time he/she emits the desirable response.

18. After a child has learned a desirable behavior, he should be reinforced:
- a.) Occasionally
 - b.) Once out of every two times the behavior occurs.
 - c.) Whenever the behavior occurs.
 - d.) Not at all.
19. Asking a parent to practice new skills or appropriate behavior under the therapists supervision is:
- a.) Too directive and should be avoided.
 - b.) A good method for increasing the likelihood that the parent will carry out the behavior outside the treatment setting.
 - c.) A technique to be avoided because it could easily embarrass the parent.
 - d.) A technique which should generally be restricted for use with children and the retarded.
20. Giving parents specific tasks to carry out between therapy sessions is:
- a.) A poor therapy strategy because it may interfere with gains made during sessions.
 - b.) A good way to promote generalization of gains made during therapy sessions to the outside world.
 - c.) Too directive and should be avoided.
 - d.) Likely to cause the parent to become dependent upon the therapist for direction and reward.
21. When collecting background information regarding a client's problems and concerns, which of the following questions is usually the least pertinent?
- a.) Why?
 - b.) When?
 - c.) Where?
 - d.) How?

22. John, a child who spends most of his time in front of the television, is always very poorly groomed. Which of the following approaches is likely to be the most effective in assisting John with the improvement of his grooming?
- a.) Give John plenty of care and concern. Encourage him by telling him that he is an involved member of the family.
 - b.) Assign a sibling to remind John to wash his hands and face, comb his hair, etc.
 - c.) To forbid John any opportunity to watch television.
 - d.) To make access to the television room contingent upon John's washing his hands and face the first week and then gradually adding other improvements as conditions for watching television.
23. After desirable behavior has been learned, the undesirable behavior may occasionally reoccur. By not calling attention to the undesirable behavior, what method of controlling behavior is being used?
- a.) No behavior is being controlled at all.
 - b.) Punishment.
 - c.) Reinforcement of undesirable behavior.
 - d.) Extinction.
24. For reinforcement to be most effective in the behavior change process, reinforcing experiences should occur for a child:
- a.) After the lapse of a few days in order to permit the learned behavior to become established.
 - b.) Immediately after the desired response is emitted.
 - c.) Immediately before the response is emitted.
 - d.) Well in advance of the response so it can act as an incentive.

25. Parents frequently must make a _____ change before we can expect a change in their _____:
- a.) Behavior, emotions.
 - b.) Emotions, behavior.
 - c.) Attitude, emotions.
 - d.) Attitude, behavior.
26. The most important type of feedback a therapist can give a parent during treatment is in terms of:
- a.) The therapist's genuine feeling about the progress the parent is making.
 - b.) Observable changes in the parents' behavior.
 - c.) The reasons behind the parents' problems.
 - d.) Comments the therapist has heard other people make about the parent.
27. One important reason for asking a parent to role-play him/her-self in a scene staged to represent a real-life situation with their child is to:
- a.) Allow the parent to demonstrate the feelings he/she experienced in that situation.
 - b.) Provide an opportunity for catharsis.
 - c.) Determine his/her strengths and weaknesses in interacting with the child.
 - d.) Give him/her a way to feel more involved in therapy.
28. In a group therapy session, the therapist asks a parent to role-play a situation. The parent refuses saying that she would be too embarrassed. The therapist feels that role-playing in this instance would be beneficial to the parent. The therapist should:
- a.) Tell the parent that she will have to become more personally involved if she wishes to continue in the group.

- b.) Point out that the parent is merely experiencing resistance and that she should try to overcome it.
 - c.) Ask another member of the group to model the desired behavior for the parent and then ask the client to give it a try.
 - d.) Consider referring the parent to another group because there may be a personality clash between the therapist and the client.
29. Briefly describe one case for which you have used the techniques taught in the workshop. Be sure to list target behaviors, specific interventions taught to parents for each target behavior, a graph of data collected on one of the target behaviors, and outcome.

STEP-Adlerian Instructor Training Workshop
Course Content Examination

Name _____ Date _____

1. Why do children misbehave?
2. What are the four goals of misbehavior?
3. What two techniques can you use to discover the goal of a child's misbehavior?
4. What are the indications that a child is seeking one of the goals of misbehavior? (List the indicators for each goal.)
5. How do children use emotions in negative ways?
6. What is meant by life style?
7. Why are our beliefs about ourselves and others often faulty?
8. What tend to be the characteristics of the first child?
9. What tend to be the characteristics of the second child?
10. What tend to be the characteristics of the middle child?
11. What tend to be the characteristics of the youngest child?

12. What tend to be the characteristics of an only child?
13. What are the characteristics of a "Responsible" parent?
14. What are the characteristics of a "Good" parent?
15. How can negative expectations lead to poor performance?
16. What effects can the imposition of unreasonably high standards have on children?
17. How does promoting competition between brothers and sisters usually affect them?
18. What is the difference between praise and encouragement?
19. Why is praise often inappropriate and ineffective?
20. What is reflective listening?
21. In what sort of situations is reflective listening helpful with children?
22. What is the difference between a "closed" response and an "open" response?
23. How does exploring alternatives differ from giving advice?
24. Why is giving advice often ineffective?

25. What are the steps in exploring alternatives?
26. When should a parent enter into exploring alternatives with a child?
27. How is an "I-message" different from a "You-message"?
28. How do beliefs about a child affect a parent's communication with the child?
29. What is the difference between natural and logical consequences?
30. What are some disadvantages to using reward and punishment with children?
31. When should logical consequences be used instead of natural consequences?
32. How do logical consequences differ from punishment?
33. What is meant by being both firm and kind?
34. What is meant by "separating the deed from the doer"?
35. Why is the principle, "talk less, act more" important to remember?
36. What is meant by refusing either to fight or to give in?

37. Why is it important to let all children involved in the problem share the responsibility?
38. Why are family meetings important?
39. What are some guidelines for holding family meetings?
40. How frequently should family meetings be held?
41. What are some guidelines for single-parent family meetings?
42. How can family meetings be established with young children?
43. What are some common mistakes made in family meetings?
44. What is meant by the notion that both parents and children have rights?
45. What are the benefits of giving up parental power?
46. How can parents avoid becoming discouraged in their relationships with their children?
47. What happens when parents feel guilty?
48. Name at least two faulty assumptions which interfere with our personal growth?

49. How can parents begin to change their faulty beliefs?
50. Why is it difficult for parents to give up their position of power in the family?

Parent Effectiveness Instructor Training

Course Content Examination

NAME _____

DATE _____

True or False:

(one point each)

- ___ 1. The relationship between parent and child is the primary concern in Parent Effectiveness.
- ___ 2. Parent Effectiveness is based on the concept that punishment is necessary for a healthy child.
- ___ 3. You can active-listen non-verbal behavior.
- ___ 4. "I hear you saying..." is the best way to begin a feedback (active-listening) statement.
- ___ 5. "I-messages" should not be sent when the parent is angry.
- ___ 6. Two-part "I-messages" are values, and should not be sent.
- ___ 7. "You-message" refers to active-listening statements.
- ___ 8. The twelve "roadblocks to communication" are nearly always dangerous.
- ___ 9. Parent Effectiveness teaches that parents should not try to influence their children's values.
- ___ 10. Method III will not work with pre-verbal children.

* * * * *

Please answer 10 of the following:

(8 points each)

1. Define "behavior" as used in P.E. course:

2. "Child Owns Problem" means:

3. Define the primary goal of Parent Effectiveness:
4. Acceptance or non-acceptance is affected by what three factors:
5. The six steps of Method III are:
6. The three parts of the I-message are:
7. Name three instances when active-listening would be inappropriate:
8. Define Method I, Method II, Method III:
9. Name three basic "rules" for further facilitating the Method III problem-solving process:

10. Draw and label the behavior rectangle:

11. Define "conflict of needs":

12. In "conflicts of values," I might influence change by: (name four)

13. Draw and label the emotional temperature/shifting gears chart:

* * * * *

(5 points each)

1. Briefly define "Parent Effectiveness": (the course)

2. Briefly paraphrase the "Credo" of the P.E. course:

TRAINER EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name of Participant: _____ ID#: _____

Program/Workshop: _____ Trainer: _____

Date of Evaluation: _____

This evaluation has two parts. Part A is a General Assessment of the workshop participant. Part B is a more specific assessment of the skills learned by the workshop participant. Part B comes in three versions: Part B-PET assesses PET skills, Part B-Adler assesses Adlerian skills, and Part B-CP assesses Confident Parenting skills. Each person is rated only on the versions of his/her workshop.

PART A: GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Rate each question on the following scale:
Excellent (5) Very Good (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1) No
Basis for Rating (0)

1. Enthusiasm of Participant (circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

2. Commitment to Principles and Approach (circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

3. Commitment to Conducting Parent Training Classes (circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

4. Leadership Skills: Confidence and Poise (circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

5. Leadership Skills: Communicates Concepts (circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

6. Leadership Skills: Promotes and Facilitates Discussion
(circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

7. Leadership Skills: Uses Printed Materials Appropriately
(circle one):

5 4 3 2 1 0

PART B - CP: SPECIFIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT FOR CONFIDENT PARENTING

Rate each skill for both comprehension (how well the workshop participant understood the skill)

and
implementation (how well the participant will be able to teach the skill to parents) on the following five-point scale:

Excellent (5) Very Good (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1)
or No Basis for Rating (0)

For each skill, check (✓) one box for Comprehension and one box for Implementation:

CP SKILLS	Comprehension						Implementation					
	5	4	3	2	1	0	5	4	3	2	1	0
1. Behavioral Analysis of Problems												
2. Praise												
3. Mild Social Punishment												
4. Ignoring												
5. Time-Out												
6. Special Incentive Systems												
7. Contracting												
8. Devising Behavioral Programs												

PART B - PET: SPECIFIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT FOR PET

Rate each skill for both comprehension (how well the workshop participant understood the skill) and

implementation (how well the participant will be able to teach the skill to parents) on the following five-point scale:

Excellent (5) Very Good (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1)
or No Basis for Rating (0)

For each skill, check (✓) one box for Comprehension and one box for Implementation:

	Comprehension							Implementation						
PET SKILLS	5	4	3	2	1	0		5	4	3	2	1	0	
1. The Rectangle														
2. Problem Ownership														
3. Active Listening														
4. I-Messages														
5. Positive I-Messages														
6. Modifying the Environment														
7. Distinguishing Methods I and II														
8. Method III														
9. Becoming a Better Model														
10. Becoming a Consultant														
11. Modifying Self														
12. Parent Effectiveness Objectives														
13. Parent Effectiveness Philosophy														

PART B - ADLER: SPECIFIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT FOR ADLERIAN PARENT TRAINING

Rate each skill for both comprehension (how well the workshop participant understood the skill) and implementation (how well the participant will be able to teach the skill to parents) on the following five-point scale:

Excellent (5) Very Good (4) Good (3) Fair (2) Poor (1)
or No Basis for Rating (0)

For each skill, check (✓) one box for Comprehension and one box for Implementation:

	Comprehension							Implementation						
ADLERIAN SKILLS	5	4	3	2	1	0		5	4	3	2	1	0	
1. The Goals of Misbehavior														
2. The Goals of Positive Behavior														
3. Encouragement														
4. Reflective Listening														
5. Problem Ownership														
6. Exploring Alternatives														
7. I-Messages														
8. Natural and Logical Consequences														
9. Family Meeting														

SEMINAR IN

IMPLEMENTING AND MAINTAINING PARENT TRAINING CLASSES IN AGENCIES

I. Clarification of Agreement between CICC and Agencies, and Agency and Participant Responsibilities

- A. Incorporating parent training classes into on-going services of agency.
- B. Training 30 parents within six month period.
- C. Other participant uses of training within the agency and in other community and private settings.

II. Parent Training Classes in Agencies

- A. Definition of terms.
- B. Objectives of classes.

III. Gaining Agency Support for Parent Training Classes

- A. Basic principles.
- B. Issues, concerns, objections and resistances of agencies.

IV. Generating Classes

- A. General ideas.
- B. Client service classes.
- C. Community service classes.
- D. Co-Sponsored classes.
- E. Newspapers.
- F. Television and radio.
- G. Community group speeches.
- H. Utilizing current participants.
- I. CICC referrals.

V. Issues in Conducting Classes

- A. Taking care of basics beforehand (space, materials, child care, transportation, contact persons, policy on guests, etc.).
- B. Group issues: Size, Composition.
- C. Orientation meetings.
- D. Maintaining participation and attendance.
- E. Referring parents/children to other services.
- F. Graduation and certificates.
- G. Follow-up, advanced and continuing classes.

VI. Funding of Parent Training Classes

- A. Client service classes and parent fees.
- B. Community service classes and parent fees.
- C. Single class funding.
- D. Grant funding.

VII. Evaluation of Seminar

II. PARENT TRAINING CLASSES IN AGENCIES:

DEFINITION OF TERMS AND OBJECTIVES OF CLASSES

A. Definition of Terms

Parent Training Classes (i.e., PET, STEP, Confident Parenting) - time-limited parent groups which are led by qualified instructors who (a) create a supportive group environment for sharing child rearing problems, and who (b) teach a specific set of child rearing skills and ideas.

Agency Sponsored Classes - those conducted under the auspices of one agency or subdivision of an agency.

Co-Sponsored Classes - those conducted under the auspices of two or more agencies or organizations.

Client Service Classes - those for only official clients of an agency and/or the relatives of official clients.

Community Service Classes - those for persons who are not official agency clients.

Combined Classes - those for both official agency clients and/or their relatives and other people.

B. Objectives of Parent Training Classes in Agencies

Basic Objectives

1. To improve parent-child relationships and family functioning.
2. To increase parental and child self-esteem.
3. To increase positive parent-child communication and interaction.
4. To decrease abusive child rearing methods.
5. To decrease isolation in child rearing.

Other Objectives

1. To identify parents and children who are in need of additional services.
2. To serve as an adjunctive service to other services that are being provided for the parents and children.

III. GAINING AGENCY SUPPORT

A. The Basic Principles

1. Maintain positive relations with agency staff and administrators.
2. Be knowledgeable about the issues, concerns, objections and resistances which are likely to be encountered in gaining agency support.
3. Use the human relationship principles and skills which you learned in your workshop trainings to deal with agency issues, concerns, etc.

B. The Issues, Concerns, Objections and Resistances

1. Research support for parent training. (Is there any research to show that parent training works? How do you know these programs are effective? Etc.)
2. Image problems of parent training programs. (Aren't these programs just for middle class parents? These programs are fine for whites but not minority folks. Behavior mod is for rats not people. Etc.)
3. Covert threat to staff. (Professional threats: If parent training works, we won't have any more patients. If parent training works, therapy won't be needed. If parent training works, I won't be needed. Personal threats: I hit my kids and I'm not an abuser. Giving rights to children is the first step to anarchy. Etc.)
4. Infringement upon family privacy and parental rights. (Don't these programs invade the privacy of the family? Don't they take away parental rights? Aren't they just another example of government infringement?)
5. Discomfort with the term "training." (Animals are trained, humans are not. Etc.)
6. Appropriateness of the agency for sponsoring parent training programs. (Is it appropriate for a treatment or social service agency to offer parent training?)
7. Costs and benefits to agency for running parent training programs. (How much staff time will be involved? How much will the materials cost? What will the agency get? Etc.)

IV. GENERATING CLASSES

A. General Ideas

1. Decide on type of class to offer. Make a decision whether you will conduct Client Service, Community Service or Combined classes, and whether you will do this on an agency sponsored or co-sponsored basis.
2. Set the dates, times and location for the first class. Do this at least six weeks before the starting date, and make sure that the space (room, auditorium, house, etc.) is available for all class sessions.
3. Start talking to anyone and everyone. Tell colleagues, associates, friends about the training that you have just completed. Let them know how the experience affected you as a person. Share your enthusiasm. Ask them to help build your classes by referring parents, distributing flyers, etc.

B. Client Service Classes

1. Create or utilize flyers or brochures about your class. Having these available will give you something to distribute as you deliver presentations and hold informal meetings. They should include a description of the course, your credentials (including where you received training to conduct the course), the times, dates, location and fees (if any) of the course. Be sure to include a contact person and phone number! Obtain administrative approval to display these flyers on agency bulletin boards, and to leave some in reception areas.
2. Deliver presentation at staff meeting. Share information and enthusiasm, and be prepared to answer questions like those raised in the Gaining Agency Support section. Have flyers or brochures available for distribution. Explain how the staff can refer clients and/or client relatives to your upcoming class(es).
3. Hold individual meetings with key agency personnel. This includes clerical staff and intake workers as well as clinical staff and administrators. Share enthusiasm and let them know how their support can help make your classes a success.
4. Place story in agency newsletter. Tell good things about the training you have received and share enthusiasm about bringing the class to your agency. (See attached example).

C. Community Service Classes

Many of the procedures and processes for Client Service Classes also apply here. The major difference is that you are drawing participants from the general community and not from the client caseload of the

agency. The sections below on Community Group Speeches, Newspapers, Television and Radio contain additional information on how to attract the general community. Distribute the class flyers to agency personnel and ask them if they will give them to people who they know. Also distribute flyers at churches, nursery schools, day care centers, public schools, private schools, shopping centers, doctors offices, etc. Obtain approval to have the flyer or brochure displayed on a bulletin board at these parent gathering spots. If you have a poster, see if they will display it for you.

D. Co-Sponsored Classes

The above procedures and processes apply here also. The difference is that you are working with another group or organization to make your classes a success.

1. Be very specific about what is expected from the co-sponsor. The attached CICC-Head Start Agency Agreement and packet gives you some ideas for arriving at an agreement and for a distribution of responsibilities.

2. Have co-sponsor promote class. The co-sponsor will have access and relationships to prospective participants that should be utilized to generate the classes. Have the head of the co-sponsoring group send personal letters to the constituents to promote participation; the class flyer should be included in this letter or the letter should include the information from the flyer. Have the co-sponsor include a story on the class in their newsletter, and have them place flyers in convenient places around their organization.

3. Arrange to give a speech to co-sponsor's staff and/or constituency. Ideas for community speeches are indicated below and agency presentations or speeches have been discussed above.

E. Newspapers

Local or community newspapers are most likely to run a story on an activity that is happening in their area, and large papers like the L.A. Times have weekly supplements for specific areas (San Gabriel Valley, San Fernando Valley, etc.).

Look for an angle or a unique aspect to your parenting class that makes it newsworthy or of special human interest. It could be the first time your agency has offered this service, or the first time this class has been offered in your area, or a unique meeting of local or multi-cultural families, etc.

1. Spend a little time researching to get the name of the feature or city editor (the contact person). Knowing the name personalizes the contact. Make a phone call to that person and share as much of your story as the person seems interested in, and offer to send some material.

2. Prepare a news release which should be double spaced and preferably limited to one page. Write "Press Information - For Immediate Release" at the top of the page along with your name and phone number.

(a) Begin the release with "Who, What, When, Where" followed by "Why."

(b) Include the outstanding points about your class, something about yourself and your agency, and possibly some background on the origin of the parent training class or how you became an instructor. Make it sound exciting, which it is!

(c) Attach a personalized note to the press release as a follow-up to your initial phone contact.

3. Be sure to call back after the press release has been received and try to get confirmation of the story. The person may need to hear more from you or may want to meet with you or may simply need to be reminded of the story. Remember, enthusiasm is contagious, even with veteran newspeople! (See attached examples).

4. If you are successful with a media person, be sure to go back to that same person the next time you want coverage, or invite that person to your next class.

5. Also, check to see if the paper(s) of your choice have a section announcing local events. This is another way to get free publicity.

F. Television and Radio

Two possibilities for television publicity are (a) to get yourself booked as a guest on a public affairs program, and (b) to have your agency run public service announcements (PSA's) about the parent-ing class.

1. Contact the Southern California Broadcasters Association (SCBA) at 1800 North Highland Avenue, Hollywood, California 90028, phone (213) 466-4481 to obtain a list of local public affairs talk shows and a Public Service List.

2. To get on a public affairs show, call the producers of the shows of your choice from the SCBA list. Let them know why you would be an interesting guest. They will usually ask for some written materials and you can send your news release along with a personalized letter or note. Don't forget a follow-up call to the producers if you haven't heard from them within a week or so. Also, the show might be interested in filming one of your classes.

3. Instructions for creating and sending public service announcements are spelled out in the Public Service List. There you will find a listing of every radio and television station in Southern California along with detailed instructions as to the PSA requirements of each.

The same possibilities that exist with television also exist with radio. Follow the above suggestions for television, i.e. contacting the producers of radio public affairs shows and sending out public service announcements. Give special attention to those stations that have the greatest audience in your area.

G. Community Group Speeches

There are many community groups that are composed of parents who could benefit from your class. The best examples are PTAs, Parent Advisory Councils, Child Care and Day Care Centers, Churches, Temples, and Service Clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, etc.). Arrange to deliver a speech before one of their meetings.

1. The dates and times of your class should be set before you make your speech so that you can take advantage of the interest you generate by involving them immediately.

2. Keep the speech short!

3. Don't introduce all of the skills and ideas that are taught in the class. Why take the class?

4. Avoid the "scare approach" which emphasizes such things as statistics on child abuse, increases in drug abuse, delinquency, dropouts, etc. Many parents can't believe such extreme things will happen in their family. However, if you are talking to a group where these things have already happened, focus on learning skills that will help change things in the future. It's never too late to improve a relationship!

5. Do talk about the mundane everyday problems that parents can identify with, followed by examples of your program's approach to such problems.

6. Do provide a way for parents to sign up for the class. Registration cards may be placed on the seats. At the end of the speech, announce the date of the next scheduled class. If there is a fee for the class, offer that the fee will be returned after the second class meeting if parents aren't satisfied.

7. If you do not enroll parents in a class after your speech, it is likely that they won't ever sign up. Try to obtain a commitment from parents when their interest is greatest.

H. Utilizing Current Participants

Toward the end of the class, when the parents have learned some of the skills and are experiencing the value of the class, mention:

"Because of the high cost of advertising, most parenting classes are formed through word of mouth from enthusiastic graduates of the course. If the skills and ideas you've learned seem valuable to you, I'd like your help in recruiting parents for our next class."

1. Give each volunteer a flyer or announcement for your next class.
2. Suggest they give these to their friends after they have told them about their experience of the course.
3. Suggest they call their friends several days later to follow-up and give them an opportunity to enroll or to obtain their willingness to have you or your agency call them. Get names and phone numbers.

Another alternative is to get your participants to invite one or more parents or couples to one of the remaining sessions free of charge. Get the phone numbers of these guests and ask their permission for you or your agency to phone them. When these parents are phoned, be honest about why you are calling and see if you can obtain a commitment from them to attend the course.

Some participants might be willing to organize a coffee-get-together or a dessert party for their friends to let them know about the class.

Another alternative is to choose one or more of the participants who seemed to get the most out of the class to join you as an informal co-leader in your next class. The person would get to refine their skills, share their experiences, and help other parents. The person would be responsible for helping you generate your next class.

Another idea is to simply ask your present class what ideas they have about generating your next class. Use your creativity.

I. CICC Referrals

CICC frequently receives calls about parenting classes. We will refer parents to your classes if you inform us in advance when and where you will be conducting a class and how we should have people get in contact with the class. Let us know about six weeks before the class is scheduled.

The Jeffrey Foundation

FALL NEWS 1980

Jeffrey to become center for parent training

Jeffrey Foundation is one of a select group of agencies to participate in a nationally recognized Parent Training series conducted by the Center for Improvement of Child Caring.

Jeffrey's Director of Social Work, Judith M. Harris, a licensed clinical social worker, will participate in a CICC education program to learn how to conduct the Parent Training workshops. Upon completion of this series, Jeffrey Foundation will be certified to provide Parent Training workshops to the community. The goal is to help parents of developmentally and physically disabled children gain more effective parenting skills.

Plans call for the first series of Parent Training workshops at Jeffrey Foundation to begin after January 1, 1981.

NEWSPAPER ANNOUNCEMENTS/ADS

Los Angeles, CA
(Los Angeles Co.)
Los Angeles Times
(Cir. D. 1,013,585)
(Cir. Sat. 940,923)
(Cir. Sun. 1,273,536)

OCT 24 1980

Allen's P. C. B. Est. 1888

Counseling Center Will Offer Course in 'Confident Parenting'

The Southern California Counseling Center will offer a 10-week course in "Confident Parenting" to begin at 8 p.m. on Nov. 6 at the center, 5815 W. Pico Blvd.

The class is designed to teach parenting skills to the parents of 2 to 11-year-olds. Participating parents may also have individual consultations. Fee is \$25, but people unable to pay may attend.

Parent Education and Parent Training

Having difficulty with your kids?

Know parents who need help with their kids?

Do you wish to further develop your parenting skills?

Pacific Psychological Services Center Inc.

is offering a series of courses to parents of pre-schoolers, elementary, and secondary school children on child development, parent education, and parent training. Specific emphasis on understanding your child's behavior/misbehavior, communication skills, and discipline techniques. Courses will be limited to ten parents and are taught by experienced professionals.



For information regarding courses, fees and schedules, contact Marilyn Miller, MA, Parent Education Coordinator, Pacific Psychological Services Center, 8380 Melrose Ave, Suite 207, L.A. California 90069, (213) 653-2173.

Azusa, CA
(Los Angeles Co.)
Azusa Herald
(Cir. W. 9,505)

APR 24 1980

Allen's P. C. B Est. 1888

Learn To Be A Better Parent

A dynamic course designed for parents will be offered to all San Gabriel Valley residents by the Glendora YWCA, 131 East Foothill Blvd., Glendora, beginning Tuesday, May 6.

The course, Parent Effectiveness Training, was developed by Dr. Thomas Gordon in 1962. It is designed to equip parents with usable, alternate methods in communication for problem areas. Graduates of the course find that these skills not only improve meaningful communication in their parent-child relationships but also have enhanced relationships with spouse, neighbors, coworkers and their own parents.

The skills taught include effective listening, assertive (non-blameful) confrontation, and problem solving skills so that

families can solve mutual problems in a no-lose (everybody wins) method. Class material is presented by lecture, discussion, role-play, written and reading assignments. The Parent Effectiveness Training book is supplied to each enrollee, as well as a specially designed workbook.

Parents are offered skills to use as a vehicle to implement those values, which are appropriate and comfortable for their individual and family needs. Parent Effectiveness Training is unique in that it offers no solutions (all children of eight years of age must go to bed at 7 p.m.) but does provide concrete, usable communication skills which can be used to facilitate problem solving in interpersonal relationships. In addition, many P.E.T. graduates feel that

by improving their relationships with their children and important others, their own self esteem has greatly improved.

Tuition covers the cost of Dr. Gordon's book, "P.E.T.", the "P.E.T. workbook" class materials, 24 hours of class time, and certificate upon completion of the course.

The class will meet on eight consecutive Tuesdays from 7 to 10 p.m. and is open to all fathers and mothers, single parents and all adults who work with youth.

The course will be taught by Kim Holland, an authorized independent instructor for Parent Effectiveness Training. For more information, call Mrs. Holland at 963-8257 or the Glendora YWCA at 336-7513.

Pomona, CA
(Los Angeles Co.)
Progress Bulletin
(Cir. D. 40,265)
(Cir. S. 41,005)

MAY 6 1980

Allen's P. C. B Est. 1888

Parenting course offered

A six-week course on parenting will begin Wednesday night at the Chino Youth Services office.

The weekly courses will be held at 7 p.m. The cost is \$10.

The course, designed along the lines of Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, is offered to parents who seek some guidance on how to lead their children toward more productive lives.

Topics will include child abuse, drug and alcohol problems, battered spouses, loneliness, single parenthood, vocational and educational opportunities, nutrition and medical and neurological problems.

Wrightwood, CA
(San Bernardino Co.)
Wrightwood Mountaineer
(Cir. W. 2,700)

APR 30 1980

Allen's P. C. B Est. 1888

Be a better parent

One of the most difficult jobs that an adult may have to face is parenthood, but at the same time it can also be one of the most rewarding experiences.

To help parents keep pace with the rapidly changing demands of rearing children in today's society, the Victor Valley Counseling Services is offering classes in Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP).

STEP helps parents recognize and accept the rewarding challenge of creating an effective parent-child relationship that can grow into an atmosphere of love, understanding, cooperation and mutual respect. A format of weekly lessons, discussions and

practice of newly learned skills in communication and problem solving will be followed over a eight-week period.

The classes will begin the first Wednesday in May, May 7, and will continue throughout May and June, from 10 a.m. to noon at the Wrightwood Methodist Church, 1545 Barbara St. There will be a \$5 charge for the workbook and a fee of \$10 to \$15 for the classes. Full or partial scholarships will be provided by the Medical Offices of Wrightwood. Child care will also be provided.

For additional information on the classes, scholarships, and for registration, please call Josie Moorhead at 249-3028.

V. ISSUES IN CONDUCTING CLASSES

A. Taking care of basics beforehand

1. Secure space for class
2. Obtain parents materials and training materials
3. Secure child care or develop plan
4. Secure transportation or develop plan
5. Designate and educate contact person(s)
6. Determine policy on guests

B. Group Issues

1. Determine best size for group
2. Determine group composition (type of parent, etc.)

C. Orientation Meetings

1. Establish agenda
2. Hand out class schedule

D. Methods for Maintaining Participation and Attendance

1. Stress that regular attendance increases benefits
2. Make each session a social event
3. Provide incentives for attendance
 - a. Refundable attendance fee
 - b. Toys or clothing for children
 - c. Kitchenware, food
 - d. Tickets to amusement parks, etc.
 - e. Babysitting coupons
 - f. Certificates of completion
4. Telephone and mail reminders

E. Referring Parents and Children

F. Graduation and Certificates

G. Follow-Up, Advanced and Continuing Classes

1. Follow-Up classes - to help with implementation of basic skills and ideas
2. Child Development Sessions - to convey new information about developmental processes and stages
3. Skill Usage with Others - to learn to use class skills and ideas with spouses, relatives, employers, etc.
4. Sessions with New Audio-Visual Programs - Parents Magazine Filmstrip - Cassette Series

VI. FUNDING OF PARENT TRAINING CLASSES

A. Client Service Classes and Parent Fees

1. L.A. County Mental Health Clinics - parent fees can be collected as a donation which goes into the region's or clinic's Donated Trust Fund. These funds from parent fees could then be used to purchase training materials for subsequent classes.
 - a. The collection of parent fees must be done with full consideration of client UMDAP Liability (Uniform Method of Determining Ability to Pay).
 - b. Unit of service rules must be used and entries in client files must be made.
2. Other Clinics and Facilities - charge parent fees according to regular clinic policies or develop policies just for parent training classes.

B. Community Service Classes and Parent Fees

1. L.A. County Mental Health Clinics - parent fees for these classes can also be collected as a donation, and these fees can also be used to support subsequent classes. Time used to conduct these classes should be reported as a community service.
2. Other Clinics and Facilities - develop own policy and procedures regarding parent fees.

C. Single Class Funding

Funding for a single class can consist of the funds for purchasing the parent materials and refreshments. These are relatively low amounts which you can ask various groups to help raise. These groups can raise the costs through small donations of its members or by putting on small fundraising events (garage or cookie sales, car washes, fashion shows, etc.).

Some of the groups that could help in these ways are: chambers of commerce, social clubs, fraternities and sororities, local merchants, clinic advisory councils, PTAs, Parent Advisory Councils, etc.

D. Grant Funding

1. Conceptualize parent training services within the context of the priorities of a particular funding source. For example, conceive of parent training as a child mental health, child abuse prevention, delinquency prevention, drug abuse prevention, or a special education service.
2. Uncover appropriate funding source and shape proposal to meet its priorities and procedures. The attached list of References on Funding Information and Sources provides ideas on
 - a. How to locate grant funding sources (corporations, foundations, and government agencies)
 - b. How to prepare grant applications

REFERENCES ON FUNDING INFORMATION AND SOURCES

California's Leading Companies in 1979. Reprint from the Outlook Section of the Los Angeles Times, Sunday May 13, 1979. Available from the Los Angeles Times, One dollar.

Federal Programs that Relate to Children: 1979. A compilation of the children's programs which are in the 29 Executive Branch agencies of the U.S. Government. Contains descriptions of the programs and who to relate to for information. Available from Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Washington, D.C. 20201. DHEW Publication No. (OHDS) 79-30180. Free.

Grants: How To Find Out About Them and What To Do Next. By Virginia P. White. New York: Plenum Press, 1975. Hardcover book.

Guide to California Foundations, 1978 Edition. Published by the Northern California Foundation Group, P.O. Box 5646, San Francisco, California 94101. Six dollars.

How To Raise Money For Kids: Public and Private. Published by the Coalition for Children and Youth, 815 - 15th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. February 1978. Two dollars.

Stalking The Large Green Giant: A Fundraising Manual for Youth Service Agencies. Published by The National Youth Work Alliance, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1980. Paperback.

Where Do You Look? Whom Do You Ask? How Do You Know? Information Resources for Child Advocates. A helpful publication for finding statistics on families and children which can be used as part of a funding proposal or grant application. Published by the Children's Defense Fund, 1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 1980. Paperback.

CICC - HEAD START AGENCY AGREEMENT

PROGRAMS FOR PARENTS

CICC provides:

1. One or more parent training classes from those listed in the Programs for Parents brochure.
2. A professional instructor to lead the class which includes paying the instructor's fee and travel expenses.
3. Class materials for the parents, including text books, work-books and pamphlets which the parents keep.
4. Printed descriptions of the particular class for the agency to use in getting parent participation.
5. Attendance records which will be shared with the agency so that it can receive credit for parent participation.
6. Questionnaires for the parents to fill out to determine the effectiveness of the class.
7. A person to coordinate the class with the agency.

Head Start Agency provides:

1. A sufficient number of parents of Head Start children to participate in each class.
2. Suitable space in which to conduct the class (a conference room, a classroom, etc.).
3. Child care for parents who need it, including a definite plan with back-ups.
4. Transportation for parents who need it, including a definite plan with back-ups.
5. Nutrition for the parents (coffee, snacks, etc.)
6. A person to coordinate the class with CICC.

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Class: _____ Instructor: _____
Location: _____ Coordinator: _____
_____ Contact Person: _____
_____ Phone #: _____

Session Number

Day and Date

Time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

INDIVIDUAL CLASS SESSION: SIGN-IN ATTENDANCE SHEET

Class: _____ Date: _____

Location: _____ Instructor: _____

Session Number: _____

Persons In Attendance

1. _____	11. _____
2. _____	12. _____
3. _____	13. _____
4. _____	14. _____
5. _____	15. _____
6. _____	16. _____
7. _____	17. _____
8. _____	18. _____
9. _____	19. _____
10. _____	20. _____

Note to Instructor: At the end of each session, call CICC (980-0903) to give the names of the persons who attended the session.

PLEASE PRINT

CLASS ROSTER

PLEASE PRINT

Class: _____ Instructor: _____

Location: _____ Phone #: _____

Address: _____ Coordinator: _____

Phone: _____ Phone #: _____

Meeting Dates and Times: _____

	Name	Address	Phone #	Needs Child- care	Transpor- tation
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					

TRANSPORTATION FOR PARENTS

Class: _____ Instructor: _____ Phone #: _____

Location: _____ Coordinator: _____ Phone #: _____

Meeting Dates and Times: _____

Name of Parents	For Whom (Names, Ages)	Person(s) Responsible	Method(s) of Provision
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			

CHILD CARE FOR PARENTS

Class: _____ Instructor: _____ Phone #: _____

Location: _____ Coordinator: _____ Phone #: _____

Meeting Dates and Times: _____

Name of Parents	For Whom (Names, Ages)	Person(s) Responsible	Method(s) of Provision
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			241
13.	240		
14.			
15.			
16.			

Plan for Generating and Maintaining

Parent Training Classes

I Basic Information

1. Type of Class: ☐ Client Service ☐ Community Service ☐ Combined
2. Location of Class: _____

☐ Seating ☐ Heating ☐ Lighting ☐ Electrical Outlets
☐ Near Transportation ☐ Access: Who has the Keys? _____

3. Dates and Times of Class: _____

II Recruitment of Parents

1. Agency and Community Group Presentations and Newsletter Stories
When _____

Where _____

How _____

2. Flyer and/or Poster Distribution
When _____

Where _____

How _____

3. Media: Newspaper Stories, Radio/Television Announcements
When _____

Where _____

How _____

4. Within Agency/School Referrals

Who to contact _____

When and How _____

Follow Up _____

5. Previous Parent Training Group Participants

Who to contact _____

When and How _____

Follow Up _____

III Conducting and Maintaining Groups

1. Securing Class Materials

☐ Parents' Handbook/Manual and Handouts

What _____

When _____

Where _____

How _____

☐ Instructor Aides (audio-visual, chalkboard, tape recorder, etc.)

What _____

When _____

Where _____

How _____

2. Orientation Meetings

☐ Agenda

☐ Materials, including class schedule

When _____

Where _____

3. Maintaining Attendance

☐ Refreshments/Coffee

Who is responsible ? _____

How obtained _____

☐ Incentives

What Kind? _____

How obtained _____

When given _____

☐ Attendance sign-in sheet

☐ Child care

Person(s) responsible _____

Method(s) of provision _____

☐ Transportation

Person(s) responsible _____

Method(s) of provision _____

☐ Follow up phone calls after absences

Person(s) responsible _____

Method(s) of provision _____

VII. EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION SEMINAR

Name _____ Date _____

Agency _____

Position _____

A. Please rate each section of the seminar which are listed below. In rating each section, be sure to consider both the written materials which were provided for this section and the discussion of the materials during the seminar.

In doing your ratings, circle the number that best describes your evaluation of each section:

Number "5" indicates a very high evaluation

Number "3" indicates a neutral evaluation

Number "1" indicates a negative evaluation

Sections of Seminar

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Clarification of CICC-Agency Agreement | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 2. Definition of Terms/Objectives of Classes | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 3. Gaining Agency Support | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 4. Generating Classes | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 5. Issues in Conducting Classes | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 6. Funding of Classes | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |
| 7. Overall evaluation of seminar | (-) 1 2 3 4 5 (+) |

B. Please answer the following questions:

1. What were the most helpful aspects of the seminar and why?

2. Was there anything that was not covered in the seminar that you would have liked to be covered? _____

3. Other comments _____

Thank you for your cooperation!

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	FAMILY OF ORIGIN: WHEN YOU WERE				YOUR CURRENT FAMILY SITUATION
	BORN	5 YEARS	10 YEARS	15 YEARS	
1. Number of Persons Living in Home					
2. Number of Parents Living in Home					
3. Number of Persons Helping Parents With Child Rearing Responsibilities					
4. Main Helper of Parents (person or persons)					
5. Home Location (city, suburb, farm, etc.)					
6. Home Type (indicate a and b) a. House, apartment, hotel, other b. Single occupancy or shared					
7. Recent Home Move (yes, no)					
8. Living Necessities or Conveniences (yes, no)					
a. Enough food					
b. Enough clothing					
c. Enough heating and lighting					
d. Stove and refrigerator					
e. Couches and chairs					
f. Television					
g. Radio					
h. Newspaper					
i. Telephone					
j. Toilet (inside or outside)					
k. Car					
l. Other transportation (indicate)					
m. Other conveniences (indicate)					
9. How were Necessities and Conveniences Paid for? (Check all ways that apply)					
a. Job income					
b. Inheritance					
c. Government Assistance (AFDC, Welfare, etc.)					
d. Other (what?)					

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	FAMILY OF ORIGIN: WHEN YOU WERE				YOUR CURRENT FAMILY SITUATION
	BORN	5 YEARS	10 YEARS	15 YEARS	
10. Father's Occupation					
a. Type of job					
b. Status of job (High, average, low)					
1. In local community and family					
2. In larger community					
11. Mother's Occupation					
a. Type of job					
b. Status of job (High, average, low)					
1. In local community and family					
2. In larger community					
12. Father's Education (indicate highest obtained: some formal schooling, high school graduate, trade or business school, some college, college degree, graduate or professional degree, etc.)					
13. Mother's Education (see possibilities in #12)					
14. Type of Parents (yes, no)					
a. Natural-Biological					
b. Adoptive (Family members, non-family)					
c. Foster					

CICC FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CHART: PAGE 3

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	FAMILY OF ORIGIN: WHEN YOU WERE				YOUR CURRENT FAMILY SITUATION
	BORN	5 YEARS	10 YEARS	15 YEARS	
15. Parental Roles or Responsibilities (indicate whether role was carried out by mother, father, both parents, or other person. If role was not carried out, indicate "no")					
a. Breadwinner					
b. Homemaker					
c. Childcarer					
d. Bookkeeper/Budgeter					
e. Fountain of Knowledge					
f. Taught reading, writing, math to children					
g. Spoke with children's teachers					
h. Disciplinarian					
16. Types of Discipline (yes, no)					
a. Clear standards or rules for child's behavior					
b. Positive consequences for acceptable behavior:					
1. Verbal appreciation (praise, etc.)					
2. Physical appreciation (hugs, kisses, etc.)					
c. Corrective consequences for unacceptable behavior:					
1. Discussions					
2. Disapproval					
3. Restriction					
4. Taking away privileges					
5. Spanking					
6. Whipping					
7. Beating, choking, tying up					
17. Nature of Relationship Between Parents (Happy, unhappy)					
18. Family Health Problems (yes, no)					
a. Major illnesses					
b. Major accidents					
c. Alcohol/Drugs					
d. Other (indicate)					

CICC FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CHART: PAGE 4

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	FAMILY OF ORIGIN: WHEN YOU WERE				YOUR CURRENT FAMILY SITUATION
	BORN	5 YEARS	10 YEARS	15 YEARS	
19. Death in Family (yes, no) (If yes indicate who died)					
20. Family Religion					
a. Type of religion					
b. Degree of observance (yes, no)					
1. Regular attendance					
2. Occasional attendance					
3. Children in religious school					
4. No formal participation (check)					
21. Family Ethnic Involvements					
a. Ethnic group (indicate)					
b. Dietary (food, beverages)					
c. Clothing					
d. Recreation (dance, music, etc.)					

PARENT DEVELOPMENT COURSE:
INDIVIDUAL SESSION EVALUATION FORM

NAME _____ I.D.# _____ SESSION # _____

For Items 1-5 Circle Only One Number. Code: 1 = Negative feelings or small amounts; 3 = Neutral feelings or average amounts; 5 = Positive feelings or large amounts.

	Negative		Positive
1. Clarity/organization of information presented.	-	1 2 3 4 5	+
2. Style/delivery by the group leader.	-	1 2 3 4 5	+
3. Amount learned in session.	-	1 2 3 4 5	+
4. Usefulness of session for increasing your understanding of the parents' point of view.	-	1 2 3 4 5	+
5. Usefulness of session for supplying practical information that can be used in parent training classes.	-	1 2 3 4 5	+
6. List or describe elements of this session you can use in your work as a parent trainer.			
7. Strengths of session.			
8. Weaknesses of session.			
9. Additional comments, suggestions, etc.			

PARENT DEVELOPMENT COURSE:
TAKE-HOME ESSAY EXAM

Answer the following 4 questions. Each answer should be in essay form and should not exceed four double spaced typed pages per answer.

1. You are asked to speak before an elementary school PTA group about the different kinds of parent training programs. The PTA is interested in knowing the differences and similarities between P.E.T., STEP and Confident Parenting. What would you tell them?
2. What are the different kinds of child abuses and how can parent training programs be used in community efforts to both treat and prevent these child abuses?
3. What are some of the typical information needs of parents, and how can parent trainers serve as resource persons in regard to fulfilling these needs?
4. How might the ideas in the Effective Black Parenting monograph and the comparative research between black and white parents that was presented in class influence how you conduct your parent training program with black parents?